This Book is a

GIFT

To Our Library

from:
Shri A. DE. ALBUQUERQUE

TALKS IN EUROPE
1968

Donated by Albuquerque

AUTHENTIC REPORTS
3

By the same Author
1. Talks in Europe 1967
2. Talks and Dialogues at Saanen, 1967

J. KRISHNAMURTI

TALKS

IN EUROPE

1968

GOA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
TALEGAO - GOA
Donation ACC No. 020
Name of Donor A. De Albuquerque

SERVIRE/WASSENAAR
THE NETHERLANDS

© 1969 THE KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION LONDON

First published october 1969

MANUFACTURED IN THE NETHERLANDS

20

CONTENTS

Three talks in Rome	pages	9 - 44
Five talks in Paris	pages	47 - 98
Five talks in Amsterdam	pages	101 - 157

THREE TALKS IN ROME

1

SURELY ALL HUMAN problems are inter-related; there is no separate, isolated problem by itself. And in this there is neither West nor East. Human problems are common to all mankind whether one is born in India, Russia, America or England. We are, I am afraid, apt to consider one problem isolated from other problems instead of understanding the totality of all problems. And this can only be done if we are capable, earnest enough to investigate, to go deeply into one problem; then we shall see that all the other problems are related to it. And this is, I feel, rather important to understand; there is no problem by itself, every problem is related to all the other problems and we have, as human beings, innumerable problems. Apparently whatever we touch becomes a problem.

So this morning, and during the next two talks, we have to consider the many problems, the many issues that confront each one of us as a human being. You know exactly what is happening in the world; throughout society there is a tremendous amount of violence, uncertainty and fear, a form of organised, flourishing anarchy. Society has become a structure in which there are wars, separate religions and different nationalities, each in conflict with the other. And all over the world man has lost faith; he no longer trusts anybody, neither the priests nor the politicians, nobody, not even his own parents because the older generation has created such a monstrous society, a world in which there is constant war, insecurity and therefore fear. Religion, whether it is the religion of this country, of India or the Far East, which is

Buddhism, has no meaning any more. And although the priests in all the organized religions talk everlastingly about being kind, loving, in the name of God, in the name of Christ, in the name of all manner of deity, the fact remains that there is a great deal of envy, hatred, greed, brutality, antagonism and violence. So man is beginning to realise that there is no one he can turn to, no one to help him out of this chaos and misery.

We are, therefore, going to examine the facts, not the supposed facts nor what we think we should be, because ideologies have very little meaning. Whether you believe in God, or do not believe, is surely a matter of conditioning. In this country, as in India or elsewhere — except in Russia and the Communist world — the church through two thousand years of propaganda has conditioned man to believe in God, in a saviour. And in the Communist world they are conditioned not to believe in all that nonsense. So, through propaganda, through clever intellectual groups throughout the world — in the past as well as in the present — human beings are being conditioned by words, by various formulas, by ideologies which divide societies, the Capitalist ideology and the Communist ideology. The world is not only divided religiously but nationally as Italy, France, America, Russia and so on. Ideologies are always absurd, idiotic; they have no meaning whatsoever. The thing that has meaning and is of great significance is *what is* — not what should be or what might have been in the past. You know, when one is terribly confused as we all are, one resorts to the past, to the culture in which one was brought up, hoping thereby to shape one's thoughts differently.

So ideologies have failed, education has failed. Education can give marvellous technological knowledge which will help man get to the moon, show him how to run a computer, or kill thousands of people from a great distance, but we haven't solved human problems, that is how to live together as

human beings, how to co-operate with one another and find unity in relationship between man and man. And that's the only thing that matters — nothing else! Not belief in God, in the church with its rituals, dogmas and priests, but how to live together peacefully as human beings, with love, with generosity and without violence. That is the basic problem, otherwise we are going to destroy each other, as we are doing. We have all become so colossally selfish and self-centred because society is organized to function anarchistically, in chaos.

So every human being is concerned with this primary issue, which is to live in this world, earning a livelihood, having great technological skill, and yet not to destroy one another. To live *at peace* because peace is necessary. I do not mean the politician's peace between two wars, but peace in our daily life in which there is no competition, no destructive ambition that separates the black from the white, the brown from the yellow. And is this possible? To live with a mind that is capable, highly intelligent and therefore sensitive, a mind that knows, in which there is no hatred, jealousy or envy. This has been the major problem throughout the ages — to find a right relationship between man and man, to live peacefully without hate. And man hasn't been able to do this; we have probably lived many millions of years and we haven't been able to solve this problem. Religion has offered an escape from the central issue because religions have always permitted wars as a way of life and we have come to accept this conflict and battle in relationship. These are all facts.

We are living in a period when man has actually lost faith and trust in everything organised. I am not referring, of course, to the organisation which brings the milk and delivers your letters, but to the superstructure that society has built with its wars, its riots, the divisions which one must totally reject. And there is a revolt against this society by the young, by the hippies, the Beatles and all the rest of those people;

they are in revolt against the structure of a society which breeds war, hatred and antagonism.

There are two kinds of activity; either one is a total revolutionary or one merely revolts. We are not using the word 'revolutionary' in the Communist sense, the bloody revolution to overthrow the government and effect an economic change; we are not talking of that at all. By total revolution we mean that a man — who has been so heavily conditioned for centuries by words and propaganda — can free himself completely from the structure of a society which he himself has created psychologically through ambition, greed, envy and brutality. And this is the highest form of revolution, a revolution in the psyche itself, a total mutation of the mind. If this does not take place, then the revolution today of the young people throughout the world has very little meaning. First it is essential to understand the whole structure of society; how man has put it together, invented gods and therefore has created a corrupt society divided into countries, nations, different religions and so on. Without understanding this structure, merely to revolt against it is to fall into another trap. So we are faced with this problem of youth revolting against society and possibly falling into a new trap. And he will, because he does not understand the psychological structure which has brought it about. A real revolutionary is the man who understands *completely, not intellectually,* this social order which is himself because he is part of that social order.

The problem then is that for man to change radically, fundamentally, there must be a mutation in the very brain cells of his mind. And that has been going on; people have said you must change, you must act, you must change your mind, your heart, you must be something totally different. This has been preached for thousands of years by men who were very serious, very earnest, as well as by the charlatans who were out to exploit people. And we have reached a point

when we have no time at all. Please understand this. We haven't time to make this change gradually. The intellectuals throughout the world have realised this, that man is on the edge of a precipice, that he is going to destroy himself. No religions, no gods, no saviours, no masters and all the nonsense of the gurus, are going to prevent it. The intellectuals say we must invent a new drug, a golden drug that will bring about a complete chemical change; and the scientists are probably going to find such a drug. I do not know if you are aware of all this. Now although the whole physical organism is a bio-chemical result, can a drug, a super drug make you love, make you kind, generous, gentle, non-violent? I do not think so; a drug cannot make one human being love another. Love is not a product of thought. Love is not something which can be cultivated as you would cultivate a flower in a garden. Love cannot be bought in a drugstore and love is the only thing that is going to save man, not all the religious tricks, neither the rituals nor the army. One may escape to concerts, museums, to various kinds of entertainment, all to no avail for man is now facing a tremendous problem; whether he can radically change, bring about a total mutation in his whole consciousness — not tomorrow, nor a few years hence, but now! That is the main issue; whether man, whatever country he inhabits, with all the beauty of the land, can bring about such a radical mutation within himself *immediately.* That is the problem, not your beliefs, ideologies, gods, saviours, priests and rituals; they no longer have any meaning.

So, during these talks, if you are at all serious, we are going to try to find out if it is at all possible for man — that is you and I — to change our whole way of thinking, our whole way of living, not verbally, not intellectually but *actually* because life is relationship; and without relationship there is no life. Even the monk in his monastery, which is really a mode of escape, even he is related. Relationship means life,

and when there is conflict in that relationship, whether it be within yourself, or with your husband, your wife, your neighbour or with anybody, then life becomes a battlefield. We have made of our life the daily living which ultimately ends in Vietnam; and we are *all* responsible for this, not just the Americans, but the Italians, the Russians, the Indians, everybody! Everybody is responsible for war because we are human beings and we have created wars; that's part of our life. And to say the Americans are dreadful people, violent people — so are you! You don't feel this responsibility at all!

The other day we were walking through a wood; it was spring-time and there wasn't a single bird in sight. And two men passed by carrying guns. Your whole life is violent; you are brought up to kill animals to eat. I don't think you realise how terribly serious this whole thing is; if each one of you felt totally responsible for every war, then you would create a different kind of society with a different form of education, with different history books. But you're not interested, you don't feel responsible. And that's why the younger generation are revolting against it — they must! Unfortunately they don't understand the nature of human beings so they will create another society which will be corrupt and destructive in a different way. The problem is: how to bring about this change in the human mind and the human heart and whether the intellect can ever bring about this change. There is this capacity to think very clearly, very sanely, logically, objectively; that is the function of the intellect. But the intellect, as we now see, has brought about this destructive society in the world; it has invented guns, it has invented class distinction, and seeking security it has created gods and the organisation of belief which is called religion. So thought has brought about this structure which is called society and thought is responsible for it. The intellect is responsible for the war within yourself, the war in Vietnam, the war between you and your wife or husband, and the war with your neighbour.

The intellect through the function of thought has produced all this; it has also invented the atomic bomb, the computer, the jet, the nuclear missiles that can destroy thousands of people. And, at the same time, it has provided modern man with comfort. So man — if he is at all aware — asks whether thought can by itself bring about this change? Thought being the response of memory which is the accumulation of experience as knowledge. And can that knowledge, that experience, which is memory, bring about a radical revolution in our minds and hearts?

Please, this is not a lecture given by a professor to which you casually listen, agreeing or disagreeing, accepting what you like and rejecting what you don't like. This is not that kind of a talk; here we are sharing the problems together as two human beings. We are trying to take a journey together into this enormously complex problem of living, so it's your responsibility *how* you listen and what you do with what you have listened to, because when you listen with full attention — and you can only listen that way if you are really serious — you will see the enormous danger, then you will become serious. But if you listen with your prejudices as a Catholic, as a Protestant, as a Hindu or as a Buddhist, whatever you are, then you are not listening at all. You can only listen when you are not translating what is being said into your own terminology, your own background. Listening is an act, an immediate act, which reveals the whole problem. It's like seeing. I do not know if you have ever tried to look at a flower, a cloud or a tree. Are you looking at that flower, that cloud or that tree through the images you have about them? If you are, then you are not really looking at the flower, but at the image you have built about that flower. In the same way you look at another through the image, the wife looking at the husband with the image she has built throughout the years of marriage or non-marriage. And he has built an image about her, the image being the pleasure

and the pain, the flattery and sexual gratification, the arguments and insults; you know how one builds in relationship. So neither do you look at the flower without the image nor at your husband, your wife or your neighbour — so you *never look!* You never look at a flower nor at a beautiful statue; you have an image, a symbol, you want to find out who made it, only then do you begin to admire. So when you are listening to this talk, please listen — don't have images! Then you will see that if you actually give your whole mind and heart to it, you will have nothing whatever to do, you will have done it. Therefore an enormous change takes place.

So, as we were saying, this is not a talk in which your intellect merely indulges in the clever tricks of argument, opinion and judgment. We are examining very seriously this complex problem of living which is your life, not the life of the speaker or the life which he may describe. It is your life and your life is responsible for the wars, for the misery, for the agony of every human being. And our question is whether or not it is possible to change.

Certain things are involved in bringing about this change. We must find out what it means; again this is a very complex problem. You see, for most of us, change means a gradual process. I am this; I am violent — if you are aware at all of your own violence. I am violent and gradually, day by day, I will get rid of it. And therefore man has invented the ideology of non-violence. But the fact is I am violent, in my life, the way I act. I am violent in my speech, the way I talk to people and in my manner, the way I look at people; every part of me is violent. That's a fact, that's *what is.* And I don't know what to do about it, how to try and change it so I invent an ideology which is — I must not be violent. And I hope by asserting I must not be violent, or by using the ideology of non-violence as an inspiration, that I'll get rid of violence. So, there is an interval between the fact of what is and what should be; is that quite clear? Now

when there is this ideology of what should be, which is totally different from what is, then begins the conflict of duality. And man has invented this as a means of escape from what is, man indulges in escapes. In India they are everlastingly talking of non-violence, the ideology; they have preached it up and down the land. And here in Italy you have, too, in your own way. And that leads to great hypocrisy, because if you avoid the fact of what is then you're bound to be a hypocrite. So ideologies such as non-violence only lead to greater conflict.

Please follow this step by step because I am going into it. I don't know what to do with violence. I've always been taught not to be violent or to indulge in violence and find reasons for it; after all, violence is our heritage from the animals, you are the result of the animal, and with one or two rare exceptions, all animals are predators. But the opposite of what is always breeds conflict; please understand this very simple psychological fact. If you see this, not intellectually but *actually,* then you will have no ideals, no opposites, then you are faced with the fact of what is. The question then arises: is it possible to change what is? And if there is no opposite, then 'what is' is all right. Let me explain this a little more fully if I may. I am angry or I dislike something; this is a form of violence, there is a great deal of violence in me as a human being. Now if I am not the opposite, how do I know I am violent? Are you following all this? Do I know violence only because I know non-violence? This is very important to understand because we are going into the question of complete change, how to be completely free from violence, not only consciously but also at the unconscious level, so one must be very clear about all this. If you have no opposite as non-violence, how do you know you are violent? Do you know it only because you have the word which says you are violent? We live on words, to us the word means the very thing; the word God to a believer

is tremendously important. But the word is not the thing; the word 'door' is not the door. The word 'microphone' is not the microphone, the thing you touch, but to us the symbol has become the reality; in a temple or church the image is to us the reality. So we must be very clear when we are looking into this question of violence, whether or not it is the word that makes us violent. And, because we have the opposite therefore we know we are violent and if we have neither the word nor the opposite what is violence? Take your own violence for instance — I am sure you are all violent in your own little ways — and look at it! Is that state of anger, hatred, the result of the opposite or is it evoked by the word, the word being thought? You cannot think without the word, without the symbol; there is no thinking at all without the word. If you have no word, there is no thought. So thought recognises — thought being memory and all the rest of it — this as violence because it has experienced violence before; when there is a violent reaction, thought recognises it as violent. That's simple. Thought through the word says this is violent; but thought is always old, thought can never be new, thought being memory, experience, knowledge whether that memory, experience, knowledge is conscious or unconscious. So thought, always being old, recognises the response as violence, but can thought remain silent when the response of anger comes?

This requires a great deal of meditation which perhaps we will go into another time. As Christians — believing in certain symbols, beliefs and dogmas — you have been conditioned through two thousand years of propaganda as they have been in India for more than five thousand years. So you are the result of all this organised thinking. The problem then is: can you look at yourself *without* the symbol of thought because when you look at yourself *through* thought — thought being the old — you are looking at yourself in the old pattern; therefore you are establishing more and more

the tradition of what you are. So can you look at yourself, can you look at what you have called violence without the whole mechanism of thought? This doesn't mean you go to sleep or become blank; on the contrary, it means awareness and the highest attention.

If I may ask, have you ever given complete attention to anything? Complete attention, that is with your eyes, your ears, your nerves, your heart, with everything. And in that attention, is there thought? When we give complete attention — in the sense we are using it — to that feeling which we have called 'violence', is there violence? If you have followed what has been said, not verbally or intellectually, but actually using the speaker as a mirror in which you are looking at yourself, then you will see that when you give complete attention to something, thought is wholly absent; therefore the thing which was is totally changed.

You know, we are used to change through will; I want to do this, I must change that. That's the way we have been taught to try and do it, but will is the product of desire. We are not saying desire is right or wrong, we are looking at the fact. When you look at a fact there is no judgement; it is a fact. Will is the result of desire, strengthened and hardened, and through will we hope to change. When we examine will — which is the very essence of desire — we see that in will there is involved pleasure. So we say I want to change because the other state will be more pleasurable, more secure. Will then is not the way to bring about a change because in it is involved thought, desire and pleasure. Our whole social morality, which is really immoral, is based on pleasure. I don't know if you have observed this but it is fairly obvious. So thought cannot possibly change the human mind because thought is memory, thought is always the old; and will is also the old. Do look at it, examine it; then you will find out for yourselves. The habits we have cultivated through thought, through will, as a means of bringing about a change

are completely useless because man has tried all that. Then what is one to do? If neither thought nor will can change violence — and it is a proven fact, not a theory, that neither of these two has ever brought about a radical revolution in the human mind — then what can?

I hope you have followed so far, not in abstraction but actually. You know, to look at anything one must have new eyes, eyes that are innocent, eyes that are seeing things for the first time. And to understand this violence, you must look at it *totally anew,* not in the old way. To look at a flower or a marvellous cloud, you must have a clear, unspotted eye, an eye that has lived and seen a thousand experiences and yet is free of all experience; it is only then that you can *see.* And you can see totally with innocent eyes only when you give complete attention. You know, this attention is not the result of will. You can't say I *will* attend, I *will* give my heart to this attention; if you do then you have brought conflict to that attention. But if you see, actually see sensuously with your eyes, with your ears, with your heart and your mind, that it is only possible to bring about a radical revolution in the psyche itself when you give complete attention to every word, every gesture, every feeling, to your meals, the way you sit, to everything, then you will see that there is a radical mutation in the mind and the heart; and it comes into being without any ideology, without struggle, without effort. Such change is immediate because one has seen clearly the danger of violence.

There is another question to be considered; whether the unconscious, which is the residue of all the past, will interfere with immediate action. You know, we have given such extraordinary importance to the unconscious. I wonder why. Of course, I know it's the fashion; it's been introduced by the analysts, by the psychologists, but why has man given such extraordinary importance to it? The unconscious is as stupid, as trivial, as nonsensical as the conscious because the

unconscious is the past, the residue of the racial inheritance, and so also is the conscious brain. And you can wipe away the whole of the unconscious with a single sweep when you know, when you realise the great importance of looking at things without the image, without the past; that means to look without fear. We will go into that next time we meet.

10th March 1968

2

THE OTHER DAY, when last we met, we were talking over together this problem of violence. We were saying that violence is not only the physical, but also the activity of a mind that is not anonymous; it is only the anonymous mind that is non-violent. We also said that actually we have no time to be free of violence; that is, violence must end immediately and we went into that question somewhat.

This afternoon perhaps we can go into the question of whether fear in any form is related to violence. We see that man throughout the world is afraid; this fear has been encouraged by the culture, by the society in which he lives. When we use the word 'society' we mean the religion, the economic conditions and all that. One observes right throughout the world that fear has been encouraged by religions; it has been in order to control man, to shape his mind because through belief and dogma the church can control the whole process of thinking. If one observes, fear basically is related to authority; the word 'authority' is heavily loaded. There is the authority of law, the policeman, and the authority of tradition and the authority of experience; and that authority insists that we obey. Obeying is a form of violence because we obey out of fear; if man were not afraid there would be no need to obey at all, he would function sanely and rationally. But human beings are so afraid that their whole activity is irrational, contradictory and imitative. So, to really understand and therefore be free of violence, one has to go very deeply into this question of fear.

Fear is not only a response of the adrenal glands but also

a psychological process. To understand fear, not intellectually but actually to be free of it, one requires very keen observation, one has to look at it very closely. When the mind — which has been trained in a culture that accepts fear as a part of life with all its violence — understands fear then perhaps we can be completely free not only consciously but also unconsciously. To go into this question of fear one has to be aware, that is one has to watch one's own fear, not the fear that one is told about or the fear of the unknown, but the actual fear that one has. Fear does not exist by itself; it is not an isolated factor, it exists in relation to something. One is afraid of so many things: one is afraid of the dark, afraid of going wrong, afraid of not being traditional and of not being able to fit into the society in which one lives. One is afraid of death, afraid of one's wife or husband and so on. And out of this fear arises violence. Please, as we said the other day, this is not a lecture; you are not just listening to a speaker, accepting or denying whatever he says, but rather we are investigating together this whole problem of violence and hence the problem of fear.

As we said in the previous talk every problem is related to all the problems that human beings have. If we can completely, totally understand one problem and therefore be free of it, then we shall see that it is related to all other problems, and so the mind is freed of all human problems. Freedom is necessary, freedom to investigate, to look, to observe; and we have not that freedom, we are not free. We may revolt against the established order, invent a new theory or dogma to which the mind is attached, but as human beings we object to being free. The more civilization advances, the more we abhor tyranny, any form of political dictatorship.

Dictatorship is a retrogression, but strangely enough we do not object to the religious dictatorship. We accept the priest, the dogma, the tradition, the saviours, the masters and all the rest of it; that is, we are frightened so we accept authority.

Therefore in understanding fear, which is very complex, we shall then understand the nature and structure of authority and so become a light to ourselves, not depending on anybody to tell us what to do. This is very important especially as chaos, anarchy and violence are growing in the world. When the mind is confused, at a loss, not knowing what to do, then out of fear it turns to some kind of authority — the authority of a priest, or a new society, the authority of a new guru or a new theological concept. So it is absolutely imperative that one understands this whole complex problem of fear, because a mind that is afraid cannot think straight. When the mind is afraid, it is confused; it lives in darkness. And most of us are afraid, afraid of falling ill, afraid of old age and death, afraid of what people think and so on. So is it possible for a human being, living in this world, to be radically, totally free of fear, not as an idea, not as an intellectual concept but actually?

What is fear? One is afraid if there is no physical security; obviously there is fear if one's next meal is not guaranteed. So there is no fear physically in the economic sense when every human being is assured of food, clothing and shelter. That is a basic necessity for man, an absolute essential, but that physical security is denied by national and religious divisions, territorial boundaries with their governments and armies and so forth. So the very thing that is absolutely necessary for all human beings — food, clothing and shelter—is denied through these national and religious divisions. There must be fear as long as these ideological differences exist because they deny the very thing that is essential for man. When you call yourself an Italian, an Englishman, a Russian or an American, that very assertion denies your own security. Please do follow this because through this division you are going to create wars, produce more violence; and therefore you become insecure. When you see this as an actual fact, not as a theory or an intellectual concept, then

you no longer belong to any country, any society, any culture, and that's already a tremendous revolution.

Then there are the psychological fears, the outward fears, the fear of being made uncertain in a world that is becoming more and more anarchistic, violent, insecure. I wonder if you realize what is happening the world over; in this country you may be fairly secure economically, but there's a whole civilization like India whose people are poverty stricken, hungry, uncertain of the next meal. And there is bound to be a clash between the 'haves' and 'have-nots'. So the war that's going on in Vietnam is your responsibility and it is your responsibility to see that nationalistic divisions are broken down. The unity of man is the important thing not the nation or the family.

So the question then arises: is it possible for a human being living in this world to be totally free of fear? That's what we are going to examine. Freedom is not freedom *from* something; freedom from something is merely a reaction. If I am free from anger, it is not freedom. Freedom is a state of mind in which no problem — whether it be sexual, individual or collective — exists at all. And without that total freedom there must be violence because freedom implies the highest form of intelligence. Intelligence is not a mere concept, a formula of the intellect.

I do not know if you have ever observed that when animals are herded together in a small space they become very violent. It is because they are not properly orientated; in the same way human beings living together in a confined space are bound to be violent. So there must be freedom not only outwardly but inwardly as well, that is there must be freedom of space. We will go into that presently.

So, is it possible for man to be totally free of fear? And what is fear? Does fear exist in the past, the present or the future? Do I know I was afraid or do I know I am afraid or that I shall be afraid? Is there such a thing as *immediate*

fear or when you know you are afraid, is it not already over?

Please follow this carefully step by step because to understand clearly time is involved, and without understanding the whole structure of time we will not be able to understand fear. Now how do I know that I am afraid? When I am face to face with danger, at the very moment of confrontation, am I conscious of fear or is the response to danger so immediate that fear does not exist at all? The response is immediate. When you know the danger of nationalism which is spreading more and more throughout the world, when you *know* it, not theoretically but actually, then there is an immediate response to that danger and therefore you are free from nationalism because you see very clearly it is a threat to the security of man.

So fear is the product of thought. Right? Otherwise there is no fear. Fear is related to pleasure and pleasure is the product of thought as fear. I wonder if you are following this? You know, this is not an analytical talk. Analysis, however deep or clever, however true does not solve any problems. Analysis is merely a description of what is, and we are not analysing but just observing. It is very important to understand this, the art of looking, the art of seeing. We are seeing fear, listening to fear, to all its murmurs, not theoretically but actually. If we could see fear with eyes that are very clear then fear would completely come to an end. And that's what we are doing. Fear, as we said, is the result of thought. Yesterday I was healthy and enjoyed walking through the woods, but today or tomorrow I am afraid that I may fall ill. Do go into this with me! Please, if I may suggest, don't just listen but observe this thing operating in yourself. Yesterday there was a beautiful sunset and I enjoyed it tremendously. There is the memory of it and I want that pleasure repeated and when it is not repeated then I am afraid, which is all part of thinking. I am afraid of death, the tomorrow and the many tomorrows; thought is observing the

fact of living — what it calls living — and also the fact that it is going to end, so thought is afraid of the thing it calls death. Therefore it puts death far away in the distance. This is very clear isn't it? Thought creates distance as well as time, so thought breeds fear.

After all, there is in the Christian world original sin, whatever that may mean, and Christians everywhere have been conditioned through propaganda to believe in this original sin. And, of course, that has bred a great deal of fear. That original sin is the invention of thought, so thought is responsible for fear. The ending of fear therefore is the understanding of the whole structure and mechanism of thought. No doubt you will say that if fear is to end, thought must also stop; we are not saying thought must stop, but that thought is responsible for fear. That is obvious.

Then one begins to enquire what is the nature of thought. To understand the structure of thought, not intellectually, you must see it as you would see a sensuous thing, feel it and then you will realize — if you go into it very deeply — that thought begins to understand itself as the origin of fear and it will act upon itself. You will see this for yourself if you go into it very deeply with the speaker. Thought is the product of time, time being memory, the accumulated knowledge of the many days, the many yesterdays, the many experiences. From that accumulated knowledge, experience, memory, there is a response which is thought and thought is matter. A mind that is concerned with going beyond the sensual, beyond matter, must understand thought; thought breeds sorrow as well as fear and pleasure. Yesterday you had an experience — sensual, sexual, or otherwise — and that experience leaves an imprint on the mind, on the brain. We mean by that word 'mind' not only the whole nervous organism, the brain cells, but the totality of all human intelligence, its activity, fears, thoughts, despairs and anxieties. All that is included when we use the word 'mind'.

ALB-020

As long as thought is seeking pleasure, there must be fear because pleasure means pain. We will go into that a little bit and you will see it for yourself. Please follow this carefully because it is your life, not mine! You and I together are making this terrible world; we are causing so much destruction, so much misery and we are responsible. And without understanding the nature of this thought with its pleasure and pain, its fear and its sorrow, we shall continue to bring about tremendous chaos in the world through our actions, our selfishness and our violence. As we said, thought breeds pleasure. Yesterday you had an experience which gave you pleasure and thought wants that pleasure repeated, so it thinks about it. The more it thinks about it, the greater the pleasure it derives from that experience. Thought also thinks about pain and it doesn't want that pain; so thought creates both pleasure and pain and gives them continuity. Right? And fear is also bred by thought. I am afraid of tomorrow; I don't know what is going to happen, I may lose my job, I may fall ill and I haven't fulfilled myself and I may die. I haven't understood this monstrous life and there's nobody to tell me; I am lost and afraid, I seek somebody, an authority to tell me what to do.

So thought creates fear of tomorrow, tomorrow being death. Actually if you observe, there is no tomorrow at all; if you really faced that fact psychologically you would no doubt be terribly afraid because tomorrow matters very much — psychologically. Tomorrow is going to give you a great deal of pleasure, you are going to paint a better picture or compose with greater feeling, you'll make it up with your wife or husband. So for you tomorrow is extraordinarily important. And is there tomorrow psychologically or has thought invented it? And if there is no fear, there is no tomorrow; then one lives with that complete sense of wholeness, always in the present.

To understand the present you have to understand the

nature of time which is yesterday with all its memories, the culture and the tradition, today and tomorrow. You cannot live totally, completely in the present when there is the image of the past or the concept of the future. To live in the present is only possible when there is love, and love has no tomorrow But love is not pleasure nor desire; pleasure and desire have a tomorrow, have a future — I am going to be happy tomorrow.

So thought creates fear, thought gives continuity to desire as pleasure. Thought puts together yesterday, today and tomorrow as time; that's how we live. And beyond this we are seeking immortality through the son, through the family, through ideas. Fear breeds authority and obedience; and that obedience — whether of the son to the father or the wife to the husband — is violence because in it fear and dependence are involved.

One of the major factors of fear is death; the older one grows, the more one is afraid of death. You know what is happening in the world; the older people are pretending to be very young because they are afraid of old age, disease and death, so to be free of fear one must understand death. And if you don't understand death, you can't possibly know what love and beauty are. We don't know love; we only know jealousy and pleasure and the beauty that's put together by man. We are talking of beauty in a totally different sense of that word. And therefore we must understand, not intellectually but actually, what it means *to die*. You know, it's only when a thing ends that there is a new beginning; whatever has continuity, goes on day after day, week after week, the same old repetition becomes tiresome and rather boring. It's only the thing which comes to an end that has a possibility of newness. After all, innocency is not a symbol — it is a fact. It is only the innocent mind that can see clearly, that can see something new. You may have looked at that flower by the roadside a hundred times, but

if the mind and the eye of the mind are not innocent, you can't see the total beauty and the newness of that flower. That which has continuity cannot possibly be innocent.

Therefore belief — please follow this — destroys innocency. Belief is the result of fear. Whether you believe in God or don't believe in God, there's very little difference; they are both the result of your conditioning. You are conditioned to believe in God and the Communist is conditioned not to believe. But the believer and the non-believer has his own continuity and therefore there is no innocency to find what truth is. There is only innocency when every psychological memory comes to an end and out of that comes a totally new dimension. Death is after all a fact; we are all going to die whether we like it or not, through disease, through an accident or naturally, that is inevitable. Some scientist perhaps may discover a drug that will keep us alive fifty years longer, but it will be the same chaos. Death then is inevitable; through usage, through conflict, through constant struggle the physical organism wears itself out. Emotional stress and strain wear out the heart more quickly than actual physical activity. So there is physical death.

And is there any other form of death? We shall see. You are brought up, as most of the world, to believe in a soul, in a spiritual entity which is constant; that is, you will be resurrected. And in Asia they believe in reincarnation; that is, the believer is born over and over again until in time he becomes perfect. And when he has reached perfection — through being born over and over again and passing through these thousands of experiences — he is at one with whatever it is. That's the whole concept of reincarnation; you also have a similar concept only you put it a different way. Now fear is at the bottom of these concepts otherwise how do you know that there is anything permanent, like a soul or the atman, as the Hindus call it, within you? How do you *know* there's anything permanent in you? Is there

anything permanent? Do please examine it, forgetting your belief! Is your relationship with anybody permanent? Aren't your thoughts changing every day, either being modified or added to? And isn't your physical organism undergoing tremendous changes all the time? So one has to ask if there is anything permanent at all? And yet that's what the mind is seeking because it says: 'If I die tomorrow what have I lived for? There must be something permanent, lasting, enduring!' But if you observe very deeply, psychologically you will find there is nothing permanent, nothing! Whatever it is — your thoughts, your relationships, your ideas and ideals, your gods — nothing is permanent. We know this very deeply and we are frightened of it, so we invent another god and say I cannot live without hope, but actually all we know is despair. Out of that despair we become cynical, bitter, hard, brutal and violent. Then one sees that the thing one imagined to be permanent is thought itself. It is thought which has said there is a permanent soul, a permanent entity that eventually will evolve, become more beautiful till it reaches perfection. So the soul, the atman is the result of thought but the fact is there is nothing permanent. When you face it as a fact it doesn't create despair; on the contrary, it is only when you do not face the fact that there is hope, fear and despair. So thought creates the fear of death because you think the little property in your name is permanent. You are afraid to let go and die every day to your house, your home, your wife, your children, your relationship with your husband, everything that thought clings to as me and mine. And to die to all that every day is a total renewal.

Last time we met we were saying that the relationship of human beings is based on images; the husband has an image about the wife and the wife has an image about the husband. These two images — which are memories and have no reality whatsoever except as memories — are related, they have a relationship, but if one dies to all images then relationship

has quite a different meaning, then there is a direct, living relationship which is constantly changing. It does not mean that I pursue another man or a woman. Relationship means movement; it is not a static state as my wife, my husband, my family which is all based on an image. When the relationship is between two images then it becomes destructive and full of conflict. So we have an image about death; the thing known and the thing not known. We are really afraid of letting go of the known, not of facing the unknown; you cannot be afraid of the unknown because you don't know what it is. You can only know the unknown when there is freedom from the known, so you have to die to everything you have built up psychologically, inwardly, inside the skin as it were, this whole structure of experience to which the mind desperately clings. That is *real* death not the physical organism coming to an end, but to die psychologically to every thing you have known. I wonder if you have ever tried it? Of course not. To die to a single pleasure, an enchanting remembrance, without argument, without a motive, just to drop it. Do it some time and you will see what is involved, how frightened you are to have a mind that is constantly renewing itself. What is this thing called life to which you cling so desperately? Look at it factually, not imaginatively or intellectually, this thing you call living!

Have you ever examined it? If you have, you will see that from the moment you are born until you die life is a battlefield with the occasional joy and flutter of happiness. Is is a long battle full of ambition, competition, comparison, envy and jealousy, the struggle for power, prestige, position, making a name for oneself; and that's what you call living. And you are afraid to let all that go; you would rather cling to this ugly, violent, confusing existence instead of trying to find out for yourself whether it is possible to be free from the known. You know, it is only the innocent mind, the new mind that can be free from the known, not the old mind with its

thousands of experiences which are pouring in consciously or unconsciously all the time. When you are outside, waiting for a bus, seeing people, looking at the sky or a beautiful sunset, or when you see a bird on the wing, a passing cloud, all these leave an imprint on the mind. And only a mind that is free from experience can be innocent.

We think experience is necessary. I wonder if it is. As human beings we have had twenty-five or thirty million years of experience. Historically during the last five thousand years there have been twelve thousand wars; that means two and a half wars every year. We have experienced sorrow, disease, confusion, misery, aching loneliness, separation, guilt and agony. After so many experiences, have we learnt anything? Is the mind chaste, virgin? Technologically, scientifically, we may learn from experience, but psychologically it doesn't teach us a thing.

So only a mind which is free from the known, dying every day and therefore renewing itself, can possibly understand this whole business of time, fear, pleasure and sorrow. And it is only such a mind that can see what is truth. Truth is not a word, it is not a concept; it isn't your truth and my truth, the Christian truth and the Muslim truth. Truth, like love, has no nationality, but to love and to see truth there must be no hate, no jealousy, no division and no anger. So one has to die to all that, to all the things which we call living and only then is there a possibility of that dimension in which time does not exist.

12th March 1968

3

I WOULD LIKE to go into a very complex problem which needs a great deal of exploration and examination. I think it will have great significance if we could enquire together into this question. As we were saying the other day, the important thing is action, not a lot of talk, theories and beliefs, but rather what action to take in a world that is so disorderly, that has so much violence, with so many destructive forces at work.

There are many explanations for this outbreak of anarchy which is taking place all over the world, but both in the East and in the West nobody has organised it; there is no central organisation which has incited the students to revolt, it has come into being of its own accord. There is also the war in Vietnam; of course it doesn't affect this country, but it touches America and the whole of the East. And whether you are an Italian, an Englishman, a Russian, an American or a Vietnamese, this war, any war, is your responsibility; you are responsible, each one of you. But I don't think we really feel this responsibility. Apart from the human crisis, there is also the economic crisis in our daily life, so there is a great deal of disorder. This disorder has come about through the separation of nations, religious divisions, one group of people believing in a certain ideology and the other not at all, some calling themselves Christians, others Hindus and Muslims and so on. So these disruptive, subversive forces are at work. That is an obvious fact whether you believe it or not, whether you accept it or not; these are the fundamental causes of this chaotic existence and what is a human being to do? One can't go on everlastingly describing the causes,

everlastingly searching out deeper causes for this utter chaos, misery, confusion and sorrow; the description or analytical process has not solved a thing, so I think we must approach it from an entirely different angle.

As we said previously, we are all taking a voyage together; you as well as the speaker are working together. It is not that the speaker merely explains and you either agree or disagree with what he has said, but rather that we are both working hard together to find out if there is a way which does not lead to more confusion, more disorder and greater sorrow. So it is your responsibility how you listen, and having listened what you are going to do.

There must be order, not only in the lives of each one of us but also outwardly, in the economic world as well as in our intellectual, moral, ethical life. Mathematics, after all, are absolute order, not disorder plus a little bit of order. And the greater the problem, the greater must be the order of a mind that is capable of examining — not with prejudice, not with opinions, not with conditioned thinking — but observing actually what is. For most of us, this is extraordinarily difficult, to see actually what is and not what we think it should be. There is a great deal of disorder in the world and as a human being living in this world of sorrow, chaos and confusion, what is one to do? This is really the main issue — what can you as a human being, living in this country, do when you see the terrible disorder brought about by the army, the politicians and the priests, by individuals with their selfishness, their arrogance, their brutality and their violence. One sees this actually going on so what can you and I do? I don't know if you have ever put this question to yourself, not casually but in all earnestness, with complete seriousness, because it is only the serious, attentive man who is really alive, not the dilettante or the casual, curious, intellectual enquirer, but actually the man who is very serious. I do not mean serious according to a certain pattern of beliefs

and dogmas; those beliefs have produced chaos in the world. And we have to be serious because the house is burning, not somebody else's house but our own house is on fire. We have to be very serious, not only to put the fire out, but also to bring about a different kind of house that cannot catch fire at any time, which means living a life of absolute inward order where there is no war, no fear. And we are going to explore this inward order, that and something much more.

Since the beginning of time man throughout the ages has been seeking something beyond the routine monotony of every day life, something which thought has not touched, which is not the outcome of time. They have called it God, given it a thousand different names, but apparently very few have come upon this thing. When they have found it however, the 'clever' people have organised it and therefore destroyed it.

You know there is a story of the Devil and a friend walking along the street. And the friend picks up something from the pavement, looks at is and says: 'I've found the truth. Here it is!' So the Devil replies 'I'll help you to organise it." All the world has tried to organise truth and therefore has destroyed it. So is it possible for man to find something, to come upon this timeless, immeasurable reality without any illusion — not as an experience, not as a formula, not as an idea or concept but actually, because if we don't find that, life is wasted, life has no meaning. A man may be very capable, own a lot of property, live very well and become famous, but without coming upon this highest thing, life becomes shallow, empty and meaningless. And realising this meaningless state, man begins to invent gods, the gods of the country, of the party, the gods of the churches, the temples and so on. So is it possible to come upon this benediction which is not in any church, in any temple, in any mosque? To find that out, to come upon this thing, first there must be order, absolute order within and this order, which is

virtue, is denied unless you totally reject the morality of society. In that total rejection of social morality there is morality. Do please understand this! The morality of society is no morality at all. The social morality of any country has produced this utter chaos in the world and man living in this culture — although outwardly he may have very polished manners, go to the office, attend church and visit temples — is competitive, envious, brutal, greedy and violent. Inwardly he is immoral and this inward state is producing outward disorder, so the morality that man has pursued, which has brought about chaos is not morality at all. And order is the highest form of virtue and therefore freedom. There is no virtue without freedom, freedom from imitation, freedom from fear of authority. We investigated the question of fear the other day — whether it is all possible to be free from this tremendous burden — so we won't go into it again at the moment. Without being totally free from fear I do not see how it is possible to be virtuous; surely to be orderly, which means to be virtuous, is not an imitative process.

What does it mean to be virtuous? This is really quite a complex problem. If it is merely a habit, a repetition of what should be and therefore an animation of that, establishing a custom, a tradition, surely that is not virtue at all; then it is mechanical, then it has no meaning. So habit, whether it is good or bad, is not virtue and the mind functions within the groove of habit and tradition. Society has cultivated this, it has become habitual and therefore not free. So virtue goes with freedom, and one must understand the full significance of freedom; order is necessary, complete, absolute, inward order and that is not possible if there is no virtue, and virtue is the natural outcome of freedom. But freedom is not doing what you want to do nor is it revolting against the established order, adopting a *laissez faire* attitude to life or becoming a hippy. Freedom comes into being only when we understand, not intellectually but actually, our every

day life, our activity, our way of thought, the fact of our brutality, our callousness and indifference; it is to be actually in contact with our colossal selfishness.

This also means total freedom from all authority; and to understand that needs a great deal of explanation. The authority of the law, the policeman, is obviously necessary otherwise we wouldn't have been able to get here this morning. But apart from the law, as the policeman, is there another authority, an inward authority and if there is, what is the need for it? You know, the word 'author' means the one who has orginated something (not the writer, I don't mean that) but the author of an idea, of a concept, of a way of life, of what should not be, of what is right and what is wrong; and according to the sanctions of that inward authority, man has formed a pattern of behaviour. And being afraid, we have become followers; it is fear and the authority of what has been that makes us obey.

Please, if I may suggest, do listen to this attentively! If the mind is not free from all conditioning, there is bound to be disorder. If I am conditioned as a Hindu, a Buddhist or a Muslim then all my activity is within the borders of that conditioning, of that limitation. And authority *is* the conditioning — the authority of a belief, the authority which comes from the power and security of the Church or from the privileged position of big business. So can the mind free itself from the authority of yesterday? That is, we are the result of time, the result of a thousand experiences. There are so many influences that have conditioned man and the past, the 'what has been' becomes the authority, the tradition. The 'what has been' also dictates what we should do tomorrow. Authority is not merely the outward demand to be orderly, but also the inward asking that one must be completely secure. The desire to be secure psychologically is according to the pattern of the past, therefore it creates authority.

I hope this is more or less clear. If it is not, then I'm sorry,

because we haven't time to go into it more deeply. That's one of the most absurd things, isn't it — not to have time; time doesn't make us understand, neither do explanations. It is seeing the truth of something that makes us act immediately, not all the words, the explanations, and the whole rigmarole. A mind that is crippled with inward authority of any kind prevents order, and experience does not bring order or freedom, on the contrary. Man has experienced five thousand years of war, of killing people always with more and more efficient weapons, but basically that experience hasn't taught him a thing except perhaps at the periphery where he has gained certain advantages and acquired new techniques. He is still violent, still brutal; he will kill for any reason.

We have all experienced sorrow, the death of someone, the ache of loneliness and the anxiety; we have known the enormous uncertainty of life while at the same time demanding that it may be secure, and life is never secure. Life is a movement in relationship, but in that relationship we want security and something permanent. So, experience hasn't taught us anything; experience means to go through something, to go through and finish with it, and you cannot finish an experience if that experience leaves a mark, a shadow, an imprint on the mind. If it leaves an imprint then the next experience is translated according to the past experience; this is all fairly obvious and simple. So experience only strengthens the 'what has been' and under no circumstances does it give freedom. And this is something we are not going to accept. A mind that has obeyed for so long, that has accepted authority, that has become immoral can have no quality of virtue; virtue can come into being only when there is no conflict and there is love, and as human beings we have no love. We have only jealousy, envy and hate.

As we said the other day, surely love is not pleasure; pleasure is the product of thought, cultivated and constantly

repeated, but love is something entirely different, and if you come upon it, then there must be freedom from anger, jealousy and violence. There must be freedom from that whole mechanical process of building an image in our relationships. You know, every relationship, whether it is with your wife, your husband, your friend, your boss or with anybody depends on the image which you have created. Obviously there is an image between you and your wife; she has an image of you and you have an image about her which has been built up through many years of pleasure and pain, anger and irritation. The self-centred activity of each one in this relationship has produced an image, and these two images have a relationship, but nothing else! Love then is not the product of pleasure or thought, so it cannot be cultivated; like virtue, it cannot be manufactured by thought.

I do not know if you have ever considered what humility is. Humility, like austerity, is not something you can work upon day after day and then say I have learnt to be humble; only the vain man pretends to be humble. Humility comes only when there is no seeking or achieving; that is, when you live completely in the present, which is the totality of time. If however you are acquiring power, seeking position, in the name of God, in the name of the Church, in the name of the government or trying to dominate in all your relationships, whether it be the intimate relationship of the family or the business relationship, then obviously there is no humility. Humility, like innocence, comes only when the mind is completely quiet, and order, which is absolutely essential, is only possible in freedom, which is love. You know one hardly dare use that word because everybody uses it; you hear it in church, on the radio, in the cinema and in the politician's speech. They talk of divine love and human love, of the love of the one and the love of the many, and therefore they have destroyed the beauty, the fullness, the depth and the meaning of that word.

So is it possible to love, which is really the basis of all virtue, and therefore order. Living in this monstrous world, is it possible to love without envy — because envy is not love — without jealousy, without brutality? Surely this is only possible when we have completely understood pleasure. For us, as things are, love *is* pleasure so realizing this, man has invented the love of God which he says is not pleasure, but, of course, it is. If you are completely unafraid right throughout your whole being, at the unconscious level as well as the conscious, when there is not a grain of fear anywhere, then there is no seeking. The mind itself is the highest form of intelligence and is therefore virtuous. Order and freedom, and so virtue and love are the foundation to go further; this is the foundation upon which we can build.

Having laid the foundation, not as an idea, not as a concept, not as an abstraction but in actual daily life, we can then begin to enquire if there is something more which is not of time, which cannot be destroyed, and to find out, or rather come upon it, we must understand meditation. I am sorry to introduce that word because once again is has been spoilt by those people who have recently come from the East talking about meditation. You know, unless the mind is very still, you cannot see anything — that is a simple psychological fact. If I want to see you or you want to see me actually, physically, your mind must be very quiet; it cannot be chattering or indulging in images, opinions, judgments; it must be absolutely quiet, and most of our minds do not even know what that word means, or what lies behind it. We have a feeling that there must be a certain stillness of the mind; after all, if you are listening to the speaker — and I hope you are — you must give attention, that is, your mind must not be out playing golf, your mind must be wondering what he means by this or that, and your mind must not only be quiet but attentive. And when it is attentive then it is intense, therefore there is a communion between the speaker and

yourself, a communion that is intense, a meeting of his mind and yours at the same time, with the same intensity, and at the same level, then there is real communion. And for that your mind must be extraordinarily sensitive, alert and quiet.

The word 'meditation' is very common in the East and throughout the whole of Asia; they practise what they call meditation. One sees poor men, ill-clad and ill-fed, sitting under a tree meditating, the body motionless; that has been going on for thousands of years. In that so-called meditation there is no order in the sense in which we used the word, the order which comes with freedom from tradition, imitation and fear; there is only conformity to a pattern. Those who meditate want wider, deeper experiences which can very easily be gained through the psychedelic drugs that give you an expansion of consciousness, but that expansion of consciousness is still conditioned. So meditation is something entirely different and unless there is a foundation of order, freedom and love, which has never touched brutality, it is not possible. Then the mind becomes the meditative mind and therefore completely quiet, not wanting any pleasure, experiences or visions. Visions, as the Christian seeing Christ or the Hindu with his Krishna, are all very simple to explain; they are projections arising out of the conditioning of the mind. In the same way the Communist has his vision of what the State should be or what the citizen should be, according to his conditioning. And it is fairly easy to have visions, but whether you see Christ, the Buddha or Krishna, they have really no meaning whatsoever; they are the result of your own psychological state. When you have these visions, the more you are caught, the more you are conditioned, so all that is not meditation.

Meditation is the silence of the mind, but in that silence, in that intensity, in that total alertness, the mind is no longer the seat of thought, because thought is time, thought is memory, thought is knowledge. And when it is completely

quiet and highly sensitive, the mind can take a voyage which is timeless, limitless. That is meditation, not all this stupid nonsense of repeating words which is what they are doing. In India it is a well known trick, repeating a word and thereby getting oneself into a peculiar state, and thinking that is meditation. You can repeat the words Coca Cola ten thousand times and you will have the most marvellous experience because you have hypnotised yourself, but that is not reality. Hypnosis, whether it is done by yourself or by another, can only project your own conditioning, your own anxieties and fears; it has no value whatsoever.

So is it possible for a mind that has penetrated deeply into this problem of order to live in the world with that and act from that? To live with order and the beauty of order — order which is not habit, but which dies every day and therefore each day it is new, to live with a quality of love that has no fear, that is never touched by thought as pleasure. This is really the main issue, not what you believe or you don't believe, whether you are a Communist, a socialist or a nationalist; we have finished and done with all that. It has never produced order in the world, on the contrary it has divided man more and more.

And the young people, quite rightly are in revolt against what has been. So the question arises; is it possible to live this way? Can a man who is very serious, who doesn't play with all this intellectually but actually lives it, breathes it, can such a man live in a world that is violent, competitive, brutal and aggressive, where one is conscripted into the army to kill? Can you live *not negatively* but actively? You know, if you totally deny all that is false — and psychologically everything in this culture is false — then in that very denial comes the positive. When you see the false as the false, the very act of perception, the seeing *is* the positive. So one asks oneself whether it is possible to live, not as a saint, that is terrible. You know, a saint is recognised by society, by the

culture, by the Church or the temple, and therefore he is no longer a saint.

To be free inwardly, to love, to have absolute order has nothing whatever to do with any culture, any society, any religion. Surely to ask is it possible and seek an answer is unnecessary; if you live that way there is no other problem. Then we will not ask whether this is possible in this world, because when you live that way you are completely outside it. And you are an outsider in this world, in India, in Russia, in Italy, because you are free, because you have absolute order and this total sense of deep love, and wherever you live and wherever you are, there is a benediction. And all action is order and beauty; beauty is not something put together by man. Beauty is when there is complete self-abandonment, a total relinquishing of the self, the me, with all its aches and loneliness, with all its despairs, anxieties, and fears. Then you will live in this world as a human being.

17th March 1968

FIVE TALKS IN PARIS

1

I THINK WE ought to ask fundamental questions of ourselves and not await the answers from others. These fundamental questions must be answered by each one of us and we must not depend on theoreticians, however clever, erudite, scholarly or experienced. For the world is in terrible confusion, mounting sorrow and we are responsible for this; each human being throughout the world is responsible for this frightening confusion. Apparently we depend for explanations on others and we are satisfied with these explanations; but all explanations are naturally verbal and therefore of no great importance. Any description, any explanation of the actual state of the world is useless, it has no meaning; but most of us are satisfied by words, intellectual explanations which have been woven beautifully, or very subtly. It seems to me that we must be beyond all these explanations, whether they are offered by the churches, by the Communists, or by any group of people who are asserting themselves.

What is very important is to ask ourselves these fundamental questions, and to be utterly responsible in finding not only the answer, but, in the very answering of these questions, to *act*. Because with us action is not part of the question and its answer. Surely in the fact of asking these fundamental questions and in discovering the answers for ourselves, that very discovery must be expressed in action. The questioning, the answering and the action are simultaneous and not separate. Because when they are separate then everything is broken up into departments, categories;

and out of that division arise prejudices, conflicts, opinions and judgments. Whereas, it seems to me, if we could really ask, in the very asking we would discover the understanding of question and action; they are not separate. And during these talks, I hope we shall be able not only to ask ourselves these questions but also to understand them, not intellectually or verbally, but with our hearts and with our minds. In this process of understanding, action takes place.

One of the fundamental questions consists in man's relationship to reality. That reality has been expressed in different ways: in the East in one way and in the West in another. If we do not discover for ourselves what that relationship is, independently of the theoreticians and the theologians and the priests, we are incapable of discovering what relationship with reality is. That reality may be named as God — and the name is really of very little importance — because the name, the word, the symbol, is never the actual, and to be caught in symbols and words seems utterly foolish — and yet we are so caught, Christians in one way, Hindus, Muslims and others in other ways — and words and symbols have become extraordinarily significant. But the symbol, the word, is never the actual, the real thing. So in asking the question, as to what is the true relationship of man to reality, one must be free of the word with all its associations, with all its prejudices and conditions. If we do not find that relationship, then life has really very little meaning; then our confusion, our misery is bound to grow, and life will become more and more intolerable, superficial, meaningless. One must be extraordinarily serious to find out if there is such a reality, or if there is not, and what is man's relationship to it.

Now we want to find out first if there is something immeasurable (beyond all reach of thought, above all measurement) a thing that cannot possibly be touched by words, that has no symbol. Is it possible, first of all — not mystically, not romantically or emotionally, but actually — to discover, or to come upon this extraordinary state? The ancients and some who throughout the world have perhaps come upon it unknowingly, have said 'there is something'. Serious-minded men for millions of years have attempted to find that. Those who are casual, flippant, have their own reward, their own way of life, but there is always a small minority who are really earnest, who come upon this endless, measureless thing. To understand it, one must obviously be free of all dogma, of all belief, of all the traditional impediments which condition the mind, which are merely inventions of thought. We are human beings, suffering, lonely, confused, in great sorrow, whether we call ourselves Communists or Socialists or anything else — we are human beings. But apparently the important thing for us is the label, French, German or any other. Is is important to be free from all this because you need freedom, not merely verbally but actually. It is only in freedom that you can discover what is the real, not through beliefs and dogmas.

So, if one is really earnest in the sense that one is willing to go to the very end, then there must be this freedom — freedom from all nationalities, freedom from all dogma, ritual, beliefs. And apparently this is one of the most difficult things to do. You find in India people who have thought a great deal about these matters and yet they remain soaked in Hindu tradition. In the West they are immersed in the Catholic, Protestant, or Communist dogmas and so they cannot possibly break through. And if one is to have a different kind of life, a life at a different dimension, one must not only be free consciously from all this, but also deep down in the very roots of one's being. Then only is one capable of really looking, seeing. Because to find reality the mind must be sane, healthy, highly intelligent, which means highly sensitive.

What is important is to have a mind that has never been tortured, never been forced into a certain pattern. As one observes throughout the world, religions have maintained

that to find reality you must torture yourself, you must deny everything, every sensuous pleasure, you must discipline yourself until your whole mind is shaped according to a pattern which has been established; so that the mind, at the end, has lost the pliability, the quickness, the sensitivity, the beauty of movement. What is necessary is a mind that is untortured, a mind that is very clear. And such a mind is not possible if it has any kind of prejudice. You know one of the most difficult things is to observe, to look: to look at anything without the image of that thing, to look at a cloud without the previous associations with regard to that cloud, to see a flower without the image, the memories, the associations, concerning that flower. Because these associations, these images and memories, create distance between the observer and the observed. And in that distance, the division between the seer and the thing seen, in that division the whole conflict of man exists. It is necessary to see without the image, so that the space between the observer and the thing observed is simply not there. When that space exists then there is conflict, which we shall go into, if we have time, this evening. So the art of seeing is very important. As we said, if we see ourselves with the images which we have built about ourselves, then there is conflict between the image and the fact. And all our life is this conflict between what is and what should be.

Now, please, do not merely listen to these words, phrases and expressions, but observe as we go along, not analytically, but actually observe the process of your own mind; see how it is working, how it is looking at itself. Then you will be actually listening, not trying to translate what you hear according to your prejudices and conditioning. Because the world is in such a frightful state, there is such catastrophe and misery that we must live a different kind of life, there must be fundamental revolution in our way of living. Man has apparently chosen war, conflict, as the way of life and

there is a revolt among the young against all this. But unfortunately such a revolt has very little meaning unless one has found for oneself the basic answers to the fundamental questions of life.

One of the primary questions is: what is this thing called reality? Can you and I, living our daily lives (not retiring into a monastery, or becoming disciples of some guru, or running off to some strange academy in India) can we find this reality for ourselves? And we must — not through prayers, nor imitation, nor following somebody, but through becoming aware of our own conditioning, seeing it actually not theoretically, seeing as you would see a flower, a cloud and seeing without separation. I do not know if you have ever tried to look at anything, to look, for example, at your own wife or husband; to look without the image that you or she has built through a relationship of many years, of many irritations, pleasures, angers, to look at each other without the image. I do not know if you have ever tried this; but, if you have, you will have found how extraordinarily difficult it is to be free of images. It is these images which are expected to enter into relationship, not human beings. You have an image about me, and I have an image about you, and the relationship is between these two images with their symbols, associations and memories.

There will be division as long as there is the image which engenders the whole structure of conflict. So one must learn the art of looking, not only at the clouds and the flowers, at the movement of a tree in the wind, but actually looking at ourselves as we are, not saying, 'It is ugly', 'It is beautiful' or 'Is that all?' — all the verbal assertions that one has with regard to oneself. When we can look at ourselves clearly, without the image, then perhaps we shall be able to discover what is true for ourselves. And that truth is not in the realm of thought but of direct perception, in which there is no separation between the observer and the observed. One of

GOA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
TALEGAO - GOA
Donation ACC No. 020
Name of Donour A. De. Albuquerque

the fundamental questions is man's relationship to the ultimate, to the nameless, to what is beyond all words.

Then there is the fundamental question of man's relationship to man. This relationship is society, the society which we have created through our envy, greed, hatred, brutality, competition and violence. Our chosen relationship to society, based on a life of battle, of wars, of conflict, of violence, of aggression, has gone on for thousands of years and has become our daily life, in the office, at home, in the factory, in churches. We have invented a morality out of this conflict, but it is no morality at all, it is a morality of respectability, which has no meaning whatsoever. You go to church and love your neighbour there and in the office you destroy him. When there are nationalistic differences based on ideas, opinions, prejudices, a society in which there is terrible injustice, inequality — we all know this, we are terribly aware of all this — aware of the war that is going on, of the action of the politicians and the economists trying to bring order out of disorder — we are aware of this. And we say, 'What can we do?' We are aware that we have chosen a way of life that leads ultimately to the field of murder. We have probably asked this, if we are at all serious, a thousand times but we say 'I, as a human being, can't do anything. What can I do faced with this colossal machine?'

When one puts a question to oneself such as 'What can I do?' — I think one is putting the wrong question. To that there is no answer. If you do answer it then you will form an organization, belong to something, commit yourself to a particular course of political, economic, social action; and you are back again in the same old circle in your particular organization with its presidents, secretaries, money, its own little group, against all other groups. We are caught in this. 'What can I do?' is a totally wrong question — you can't do a thing when you put the question that way. But you can, when you *actually see* (as you see the microphone and the speaker

sitting here) actually *see* that each one of us is responsible for the war that is going on in the Far East, and that it is not the Americans, nor the Vietnamese, nor the Communists, but you and I who are responsible, actually, desperately responsible for what is going on in the world, not only there but everywhere. We are responsible for the politicians, whom we have brought into being, responsible for the army which is trained to kill, responsible for all our actions, conscious or unconscious.

But you say, 'We don't want to be responsible', we are frightened to say 'I am responsible for this whole monumental mess'. But if you actually, with your heart, feel this thing, then you will act, then you will find that you are totally outside society. You may have a few clothes, go about in a car and all the rest of it, but in order to be truly moral you will have to be psychologically, inwardly, completely out of society, which is to deny all morality. If you accept the present structure of morality then you are actually immoral. There is corruption, society is going down-hill. You know about the riots in America — and about what is happening in the Near East and worse in the Far East and in India where there is immense starvation. Each country feels that it has to solve the problems for itself while politicians throughout the world are playing a game with starvation, with murder, because we have divided the world into nationalities, into sovereign governments, with different flags. And to bring about order, the concern of every human being must be the unity of man. That means a government which is not divided into French, German and all the other nationalities.

Don't you often wonder why politicians exist at all? A government can be run by computers, impersonal, non-ambitious, not people who are seeking their own personal glory in the name of their nation; then we might have a sane government! But you see, unfortunately, human beings are

not sane, they want to live in this immense mess. And you and I are responsible for it. Don't, please, merely agree, or shake your head in assent; you have to do something about it. The doing *is* the seeing, the listening. You know when you see a danger you act, there is no hesitation, there is no argument, there is no personal opinion, there is immediate action. But you don't see the immense danger of what is going on in the world around you, in the educational system, the business world, the religious world — you don't see the danger of all that. But to see the danger of it is to act. When you see something actually then there is no conflict, there is immediate movement away from the thing, without resistance, without conflict.

To look at social injustice, social misery, social morality and culture in the midst of which organized religions exist, and to deny their validity psychologically, is to become extraordinarily moral. Because after all morality is order; virtue is complete order. And that can only come into being when you deny disorder, the disorder in which we live, the disorder of conflict, of fear in which each individual is seeking personal security. I do not know if you have ever considered the question of security. You know we find security in commitment; in being committed to something there is a great feeling of security, in being a Communist, in being a Frenchman, or an Englishman, or anything else. That commitment gives us security. If you have committed yourself to a course of action, that commitment gives a great deal of surety, assurance, certainty. But that commitment always breeds disorder, and this is what is actually taking place. I am a Communist and you are not — whatever you are. We are committed to ideas, to theories, to slogans and so we divide, as you are this and I am that. Whereas if we are involved, not committed, involved in the whole movement of life then there is no division; then we are human beings in sorrow, not a Frenchman in sorrow, not a Catholic in sorrow, but human

beings who are guilty, anxious, in agony, lonely, bored with the routine of life. If you are involved in it, then we'll find a way out of it together. But we like to be committed, we like to be separately secure, not only nationalistically, communally, but also individually. And in this commitment there is isolation. When the mind is isolated it is not sane.

We may all know this verbally, because most people have read a great deal about all this, but unfortunately what they have read does not constitute a discovery of themselves, it is not their own discovery, their own understanding. For that, one must investigate, look at oneself without any criteria, look at oneself with choiceless awareness so as to see exactly what one is, not what one should be. And when you see exactly what you are then there is no conflict.

Also there is the question of love and death. Again the thing which we call love has really lost its meaning. When one says, 'I love you' there is an abundance of pleasure in this. So one has to find out for oneself if love is pleasure; this doesn't mean one must deny pleasure to find love; but when love is hedged about with greed, with jealousy, hate, envy, as it is with most of us — is this love? When love is divided as the divine and ordinary, sensuous love — is it love? Or is not love something that is not touched by pleasure?

One has to go into this question of what pleasure is. Why is everything based on pleasure? The search for what you call 'God' is based on pleasure. One derives pleasure from having possessions, prestige, position, power, domination. But without love, do what you will, be as clever as you like, you will solve nothing. Whatever you do you will create more misery for yourself and for another.

Then we come again to this extraordinary question of the nature of death. That must be answered, neither with fear, nor by escaping from that absolute fact, nor by belief, nor hope. There is an answer, the right answer, but to find the right answer one has to put the right question. But you

cannot possibly put the right question if you are merely seeking a way out of it, if the question is born of fear, of despair and of loneliness. Then if you do put the right question with regard to reality, with regard to man's relationship to man, and what that thing called love is, and also this immense question of death, then out of the right question will come the right answer. From that answer comes right action. Right action is in the answer itself. And we are responsible. Don't fool yourself by saying 'What can I do? What can I, an individual, living a shoddy little life, with all its confusion and ignorance, what can I do?' Ignorance exists only when you don't know yourself. Self-knowing is wisdom. You may be ignorant of all the books in the world (and I hope you are), of all the latest theories, but that is not ignorance. Not knowing oneself deeply, profoundly, is ignorance; and you cannot know yourself if you cannot look at yourself, see yourself actually as you are, without any distortion, without any wish to change. Then what you see is transformed because the distance between the observer and the observed is removed and hence there is no conflict.

18th April 1968

2

WHEN WE MET here the other day, we were saying that it is essential to find out for ourselves what truth is, and not depend on others. We are so easily influenced, our minds are so eager to accept, we fear the loss of security psychologically and we are always eager to follow and to obey. And we are apt to create heroes out of those people who say they know, or they have experienced. I think there is a great danger in the relationship between the speaker and yourselves. The speaker is utterly unimportant — he is like any other instrument, like a telephone. One obviously doesn't make a hero out of a telephone, one is not influenced by the outward aspect of the speaker. So we are not in any way trying to do propaganda, influence, or shape your minds to think in a certain way. But one can see by observing the events of the world (and also the accidents within ourselves that take such deep root), one can observe the monumental chaos of the world, where technology has advanced so well with its computers and other devices. Human beings are becoming more and more mechanical, more and more superficial, filled with all the latest information, following the latest exhibitions, news, novels. And the more mechanical we are, the more superficial we become. But when we are together we are exploring a realm in which all influence, propaganda, obedience, and following, must completely cease. This implies that one has to stand completely alone. Because to find reality, all influence, all imitation, all obedience to a principle, or to an example, or to a guru, or to anyone else, has no value whatsoever. I think that must be made very clear

between ourselves, that we are not laying down a law, a method, a system, but rather taking a journey together and in that journey we may come upon certain obvious facts for ourselves, which we have hitherto neglected.

And so the responsibility of journeying together is yours as well as the speaker's. You can either take that journey casually out of curiosity, or out of intellectual amusement; or you can be very earnest and pursue it without any deviation. You will then enquire profoundly, take every step fully aware of what you are doing and why you are doing it, and so become aware in that choiceless, clear, awareness, seeing exactly what is taking place. Then you may find or come upon, this truth that has no name, that is not measurable, and without which man has no meaning. Man can go to the moon and write extraordinarily clever books, perfect his technology, establish a moral relationship, but this is all mechanical, vain and has very little significance. So it is essential for each one of us, if we are at all earnest to pursue this essential enquiry; then we shall see that there are certain things one must, not only enquire into, but also be free of. And we must be earnest, not only because the times demand it, but because, unless we are serious, we are not alive. You know, our minds are very distorted, we can't see anything very clearly, or hear anything directly — we only hear what we want to hear and we see things that please us. We are incapable of looking at something directly, without hedging, trying to escape from what is.

Most minds are prejudiced; they may not be prejudiced about colour, racial differences and so on, but they are very prejudiced deep-down because all pleasure brings about that quality of mind that is ever seeking deep abiding satisfaction and demanding experiences that will be totally sufficient. That's what we all want—wider, deeper experiences, because our daily life is such an awful bore, our daily life is a routine with endless repetitions, a self-centred activity — the ego, the

'me', expressing itself in every direction. And such a life is rather tawdry, stupid, empty — although you may write clever books, poems, have a certain quality of expression, feeling, make pictures and so on, indefinitely, it is all rather superficial. And so we want wide, profound, lasting experience of something which will be utterly real, that is not touched with illusion. That's what most of us want and probably the majority who are here want that kind of experience.

Now, a mind that is seeking experience must invite illusion, because truth, reality, that thing that cannot be put into words, is not an experience and that's the beauty of it; it is not a thing that you can recognize, put in your pocket, or organize — you can't say 'I have got it' — it is much too vast to be captured, to be held in the fist of a hand. And yet that is what most of us want, to experience that bliss, that loveliness, a beauty that cannot be destroyed.

To come upon this strange reality we must first understand the nature of experience and why human beings want experience at all. Experience in English surely means, to go through: to go through a thing. And when you 'go through', there must be no memory of what you have been through, otherwise you are not *through* the experience. Do please understand this. We do not go through any form of thought, or feeling (which is to experience the fullness of thought or feeling) if we don't go right through it; it must leave no mark, no imprint. That imprint, that mark, that memory otherwise directs the next experience, shapes the next experience. You can see this in yourself, it is not very complex psychologically, it doesn't need great intellectual or analytical capacity. We have a thousand experiences and each experience leaves a mark and that mark leaves the memory which recognizes the next experience, and so shapes that experience, conditions it so that the mind becomes more and more conditioned by the past. In this experience there is always a recognition.

If you don't recognize an experience it is not an experience, you must recognize it, name it, feel it, enjoy it or not, whatever it be; and such an experience, when it is recognized, is very limited. I recognize you because I met you yesterday, you said flattering or insulting things; that remains in the mind and next time I meet you that memory meets you. So the experience is the response of that memory.

But truth is not something of time, memory. It isn't something that you can invite, hold and say 'I have experienced it'. Like the beauty of yesterday's sunset; when you saw it there was the great joy of the light on the trees, which has left an imprint, and tomorrow you see the sunset through that imprint, you don't see the sunset afresh, anew, it isn't something totally new. Experience can never bring about that quality of freshness, of innocence. And a mind must be completely innocent to see what truth is. And so a mind that practises a discipline, in order to find reality, to experience that reality, such a mind is a dull, stupid mind; it can never possibly understand that unnamable thing. Yet, there must be discipline.

So one discovers as one takes this journey for oneself that every form of experience has its own limitation. We have had thousands and thousands of wars; we have had millions of years of sorrow and we are not free from it. So one wonders, psychologically, if experience teaches anything at all, or only toughens the mind, makes the mind more dull. A mind that is seeking reality through experience, will never find it. And that is what those people who take drugs do and by so doing they hope to expand their mind and experience a certain state: obviously they do experience through heightened sensitivity a semblance of the real, but it is not the real. One can see all this very simply; you see according to your own conditioning. If you take a drug, and if you are an artist you see colours more brightly, more intensely, alive, vivid; or if you are conditioned by religious dogmas about a saviour,

or the Masters, obviously when you take that drug, you will see your own projection. And what you project out of your conditioning is the furtherance of your own pleasure and it may superficially change the manner of your life but it is not, obviously, that thing which man has sought endlessly. So one discovers, for oneself, or rather understands, that truth is not to be experienced — that's a tremendous discovery. It can only be seen, not experienced. You know, to see something is one of the most difficult things: to see a leaf, a cloud, the light on the water, without naming it, without saying 'how beautiful it is', without being caught in the emotional prejudice of like and dislike — just to see the fact, without the interference of thought, is one of the most difficult, but necessary, things to do.

Now, as we travel together we begin to see what is necessary; that order, absolute order, inwardly, is essential. There are two kinds of order; the first is the order that discipline brings about, the order that a soldier has, who has been drilled for months to obey, to conform, to destroy himself in order to carry out instructions and that brings about the order of death, which is utterly mechanical and meaningless. But there is another totally different kind of order, which is not dependent on any conformity, imitation, any pattern, which is not repetitive of things that were seen yesterday and followed through to today. I hope that we are not merely listening to a lot of words but rather seeing the truth, the fact, for ourselves as we go along — seeing it for ourselves independently of the speaker and what he says. Because freedom is absolutely necessary. And freedom is not at the end but at the very first step that is taken. And freedom doesn't come through discipline, it comes through order. This order (not the mechanical order of respectability, the order which society tries to impose upon man, the order of a rotten, corrupt society) the order we are talking about is of a totally different kind and dimension. This order comes out of under-

standing what disorder is. You know the positive comes into being when that which is not true is denied.

Peace cannot exist if we are at war with each other, not only outwardly but inwardly; when I am aggressive, when I am violent, demanding fulfilment at any price for myself, I may talk about order, I may talk about peace, but I am a violent human being. And when I discover this violence, not only physical violence but the violence of the word, of the gesture, the violence of cruelty to other men, to animals, the slaughtering of them and so on — when I see violence, I deny it. Out of this negation of what *is,* peace comes.

So, we go on to discover for ourselves what is disorder; the whole social structure as it exists is based on disorder, with its class and other divisions. When each man is out for himself, competing, worshipping success and fame — that's part of this disorder, both outwardly and inwardly. Disorder means conflict deep within the psychological structure; and conflict outwardly, conflict with your neighbour, conflict with your wife or husband, conflict must exist as long as there is self-centred activity. And conflict is bound to create disorder; there is disorder, nationally, linguistically, the disorder that religions have brought about, dividing those within the house of truth from those outside it, and saying: 'There is only one saviour and nobody else', 'You must go through this door for salvation and not through any other door'. The worship of nationalities, the worship of the flag are all disorder. And to find out what is absolute order (and there is such a thing as absolute order within oneself, not a relative order, circumstantial order but complete total order) — we must understand what is disorder; we shall then see what this disorder is in the world with its national, religious, class competition, this everlasting pursuit of pleasure and envy. These breed disorder, and you cannot put aside all that without understanding it, without understanding the enormous complex structure of pleasure.

So order is virtue. And order isn't a thing to be cultivated; you can't say 'I will be orderly', 'I will do this and I won't do that' — then you are merely disciplining yourself, becoming more and more rigid, mechanical; such a mind is totally incapable of coming upon this beauty that has no name, no expression. Order, like virtue, cannot be cultivated — if you cultivate humility you are obviously not humble; you can cultivate vanity, but to cultivate humility is not possible any more than to cultivate love — so order which is virtue cannot be practised. All that one can do is to see this total disorder within and outside oneself — see it! You can see this total disorder instantly and that is the only thing that matters — to see it instantly. You know you cannot see disorder through explanations, through analysis of the various causes of disorder. There it is; walk down any street, watch any culture, any society in action, watch your own mind, your own heart, the way you think, the way you feel, your contradictions, your desires tearing at you and what you see is an endless corridor of opposites. There is disorder. But you can see this at a glance. You can see it at a glance — and it is only with a swift glance that the truth of disorder is seen — you cannot see it if you are intellectually analyzing its causes; it's fairly simple to discover the cause of this enormous inner and outer confusion, disorder and dishonesty — any analytical mind can see what brings about this appalling chaos in the world. But such analytical observation, and descriptions of the cause of disorder, do not eradicate disorder. So to see at a glance the truth of disorder, the fact has to be seen instantly, as you see the beauty of a cloud when you look at it casually.

Out of this perception of disorder there is instant deep order, which is not cultivable, and that's why it is very important to understand what it is to see. This is part of meditation — to *see.* I am not speaking of visions such as those a Christian sees when his own Saviour appears to him (he

has been conditioned to this for two thousand years). What he sees is his own conditioning, like the Hindu who sees his own God, his own Krishna; such perception is the projection of his own demand, it has nothing whatsoever to do with reality.

We are so unbalanced; and an unbalanced mind can see a lot of things, though its possessor may lead a saintly life. I do not know if you have noticed what odd creatures saints are! They conform to a pattern, otherwise they wouldn't be saints, they must be recognized as saints, they must follow the pattern set by the church, or by the public, or by tradition — otherwise they are regarded as mere eccentrics. And seeing — to see the fact as it is, without any distortion due to thought, prejudice, or your own conditioning — is necessary, completely necessary, as that is the whole process of meditation.

I do not know if there is time this evening to go into this question of meditation. A meditative mind is the most religious mind. Such a meditative mind does not belong to any church, dogma, or group, to any pattern of thought, it has no religion because it has no belief, it is free to look, as the scientist looks through his microscope to see what is. So the meditative mind looks without any distortion. Distortion always takes place when there is desire and the pursuit of pleasure. And the understanding of pleasure is part of meditation. This does not mean denying pleasure, as monks and saints have done throughout the world, abandoning the world, denying pleasure, and becoming hard, ugly human beings, who adopt different kinds of pleasure and are wedded to the image of their God and of their saints.

I do not know if you have ever looked at pleasure — just looked at it, when you are enjoying something, looked at it. While you are enjoying a drink, to be aware of the whole meaning of that pleasure, to enjoy, to have a great pleasure in something that is over, dead, gone, to remember it, to resuscitate it because it gave you pleasure yesterday — now,

that's the whole process of sex, the building of that image, the remembrance of it and getting terribly excited over it and its fulfilment, which is the pleasure built up by thought. Please do follow all this — this pleasure built up by thought, intensified and sustained by thought, of the thing that happened yesterday, and is now the continuance of that dead thing of yesterday. So to understand the nature and the structure of desire and pleasure is to understand the whole mechanism of thought, not to deny pleasure.

To come upon this reality, you cannot possibly invite it because our minds are too small; you cannot contain the ocean in your fist, you can have the image of the ocean in your mind but it is not the ocean, it is not the restless, blue depth of that water. As you cannot invite reality, as you cannot possibly know what it is, all that you can do is to see what is the truth of falsehood, the truth of disorder, the truth of what virtue is, the truth of pleasure and the structure and the nature of experience; just to see these facts — that's all one can do, nothing else — that is to deny totally what one is, because each one of us is a bundle of memories, memories creating future hope or despair, agony or guilt, or mounting sorrow — that's what we are. We may invent out of that we are God, that we are divine, that we are everlasting, but to see the actual naked fact of what we are, with our ambitions, with our greed, our pursuit of pleasure and success and all that — to see the *truth* of this is enough.

When you see the truth, then you avoid all danger. But we have become so accustomed to danger that we have accepted it. We have accepted war as the way of life and war is the most deadly thing, which has become very normal to us — to kill somebody — organized killing, patriotism, nationalism, the leader, propaganda, all that dangerous rubbish. It is important to see the truth in that danger, the truth of that fact, that as our civilization, our culture is a most deadly thing, every sane man must revolt against it, must totally

deny it, inwardly, psychologically. You cannot deny if you don't see the danger, and to see the danger is to see the truth of it, not intellectually, not verbally, not emotionally, but factually. Then, if you are lucky, the mind may come upon that truth; then there is an explosion of something that cannot be put into words. Without understanding that, without having a life there, a life in which your heart and mind are living at a different dimension, your ordinary life, however noble, however good, however helpful, has no meaning. This is so because the social good (of course there must be social reform and all that) but the 'social good' and the striving to improve ourselves and society has no meaning; what has meaning is the coming upon reality and from there living in society, living in this world; then there is beauty and love — otherwise there is nothing.

Then meditation comes into being (not that eastern monopoly, of which gurus talk endlessly, that's not meditation at all) and it is the meditative mind that sees, without time, what is truth. And perhaps when we next meet we can go into this.

18th April 1968

3

I THINK WE said when we last met here that we would go into this question of meditation. And if we may this morning we shall consider together one of the most important things in life.

When one sees, beyond the intellectual level, the utter chaos in the world, the tremendous confusion and misery that man is inflicting upon man throughout the world, it behoves each one of us, if we are at all serious, to find out if it is possible to change radically the whole human structure of thinking and of living. We seem to carry on indefinitely for century after century within the same pattern, within the same mould or prison, in which we suffer agony, despair, guilt and every form of violence as well as the desire to dominate and to possess power. We have lived like that, and each generation seems to fall into the trap of the previous generation. This pattern has been set for a million years or more. When one observes the condition of the whole world at the present time, any serious man must inevitably ask if it is possible to break through this conditioning, this way of life, this mechanical existence which is utterly superficial, with its loneliness, old age, despair and the constant battle of life.

To bring about a radical revolution within oneself one needs tremendous energy. This summation of energy is meditation. That word is used a great deal, especially in the East; and there they seem to treat it as a monopoly. There are various schools established where people are drilled to meditate under the direction of teachers and gurus. There is the

whole of Zen meditation, with its many methods. I don't think I exaggerate when I say that this is utterly vain, stupid and without meaning, because what we are concerned with is not having marvellous visions, nor trivial personal experiences — and all personal experiences are very trivial. We are not concerned with 'the expansion of consciousness', which can be attained very easily through will, through drugs, through a certain form of meditation — but that is still within the prison walls of consciousness, and all consciousness is limitation; always in it there is a centre and a circumference which binds, limits.

What is important is this deep radical, essential revolution in the mind. And, as we said, this demands great energy. Meditation is the summation of all energy without distortion. To change from a certain habit to another series of habits demands energy — to give up a trivial thing like smoking demands energy, to get rid of envy needs that quality of driving energy, to put an end to the various cravings and appetites that culture, civilization and society have developed in each one of us, and for which we are responsible — to change the pattern of those habits requires a great deal of energy. Because what we are concerned with is not mystical, unusual experiences — they don't change man, they don't make him kind, gentle, with an abundance of love. They may help him to be a little more gentle, a little more socially minded — but that is part of the daily convenience of life. But to break that pattern radically, profoundly, in the very brain cells which have been conditioned through centuries and millenia, to live at a different dimension altogether, in which there is no conflict whatsoever, in which the mind is tremendously alert, sensitive, highly intelligent — that demands an energy, not of will, not of desire, but an energy that comes of itself, which has no motivation whatsoever. Bringing about, or gathering together this energy is meditation. And, if we may, we will go into that this morning.

We are considering this non-verbally, non-intellectually; that is, you are not merely listening to a speaker, this is not a talk of a Sunday morning where you have nothing particular to do and come out of curiosity, or to fish out something that will be pleasant to carry home. We are here to discuss a very serious thing, to consider together an immense problem that has been confronting man for millions of years — the ending of sorrow and the beginning of a new life. And as you are responsible for every action, for every misery in the world, (but there need be no 'guilt' in this) it behoves us to listen, not only to the speaker but to listen to the *whole movement of life;* it is necessary to listen to the empty words of the politicians, of the propagandist, to the clever theoretician whether he be a Communist or a theologian who, anchored in a belief, invents innumerable ideas. You are listening to find out what is true. Because, when you see what is true, then there is no problem. It is like seeing danger clearly with your naked eyes.

And so it matters very much how one listens because we are going to go into something very complex that demands care, affection, not merely intellectual argument or agreement — we are not propagating ideas, that would be terrible. What we are actually doing together is to unfold, expose, the whole process of thought, of life and see what is actually the truth about them. And so it matters enormously *how* you listen, whether you listen casually, or whether you listen with a mind that is comparing what is being said with what you already know, or have already read — such a mind is not listening. A mind that listens gives complete attention. It is only when there is inattention that the whole mischief begins.

So we are participating together, you are not merely listening to a series of words, or formulas, or concepts, but actually sharing this problem that has confronted man; whether he believes or doesn't believe, he has always wanted to know whether there is some reality which is not a plaything of the

mind, a reality that is beyond time, a reality that has no concept, that is not based on a formula. And if we can so listen perhaps we shall come upon it, naturally, without any effort. Effort is waste of energy. We are used to effort from the moment we go to school until we die, we are always making effort, struggling, adjusting, competing. Effort in any form is a waste of energy. But what is not a waste of energy is actually to see *what is,* without any distortion, to see a mind that is afraid, to see it without any distortion, without any escape, without trying to go beyond it, but actually to observe it — then quite a different activity comes into being, because then there is no wastage of energy and the mind can tackle this problem of fear, whatever its form may be.

A mind that is caught in the network of effort at any level of its being, brings about its own wastage of energy. After all, all our action, psychologically speaking, is self-centred action. Please do observe it in yourselves, see for yourself the whole pattern, the whole map, of your life; it is self-centred, its activities, however much they are expanding, are the outcome of that centre, with all its efforts to fulfil, to become, to change, to acquire power, position, prestige, to be somebody in a stupid world, everything spins round this self-centred movement. This self-centred activity is essentially a waste of energy. You know in that self-centred activity there is the operation of will. Will is the heightened form of acute desire, the strong urge of a certain reaction, of a certain demand for pleasure. All action of will is separative and when there is separation there must be conflict. Where there is duality in any form there must be a wastage of energy, in which conflict, pain, pleasure, suffering are involved. And all our activities, psychological murmurings, psychological demands and appetites, are centred round this 'me', the 'I', the 'ego'. All its activity, if one observes, is a wastage of energy because this leads to isolation. Though you may be married and have a family, father, mother, husband and wife live their own

lives, have their own separate life — they may meet in bed, but their life is separate. He in the office is ambitious, driving for a position, prestige and all the rest of it; and she has her own ambitions, her own envy. So relationship is denied by this self-centred activity.

You can see all this very clearly in your life, if you are at all aware of your own life. You go on your own way, isolating yourself psychologically, becoming aware of your loneliness, your emptiness, your sense of aloofness, isolation, from which there comes sorrow. And then the process of getting rid of the sorrow, or identifying yourself with something greater — all that is a form of the isolating process. And every culture throughout the world is based on this — isolation, then identification and then, not being able to identify oneself with something greater, the invention of something else. This process goes on and on and on, which is again a wastage of energy. For in all this, conflict and pleasure which breed pain are involved. One knows all this more or less, if one has thought a little bit about it, or if one is aware of it all. If one is very clever one will invent a philosophy, or a new formula, a new concept and try to live according to that concept; but again, living according to a principle, to a pattern, to a formula breeds more conflict. So we are caught endlessly in conflict, pleasure, pain, sorrow and all the misery and travail of man. That's our lot!

And you see, if you really observe, or are aware that there must be a different state of life, a different kind of living, you get occasionally an intimation of it, a hint, and that hint, that intimation, becomes a memory, and you cling to that memory; then you want that intimation to be repeated, to have continuity, duration and again there is the battle between what has been and what is.

And so, realizing this enormously complex problem, both at the level of the conscious and the unconscious mind, one realizes or one asks what one can do, whether there is any-

thing to be done at all, or whether one is everlastingly bound to time, to sorrow and confusion. I don't know why we divide consciousness into the outer and the inner, the surface consciousness and that below the conscious level. Why do we make so much fuss about the unconscious? I know it is the fashion to talk about it, a great many books are written about it, all the analysts thrive on it! Why does one give such enormous importance to the unconscious? The unconscious is as trivial, as stupid, as ugly, brutal, as the conscious mind; the 'unconscious' is the thing that you have not examined, or you don't know how to examine, it is the residue of all the past, the tradition, the culture, the racial inheritance, the family, and so on. And obviously it is very limited, very small. Surely one can put it all aside, brush it away. But you cannot brush it away by merely saying 'I will brush it away'; it must be done with one glance. And that glance must be very swift, not an analytical glance, but a thing that makes you see immediately. And the immediacy of that perception is the summation of energy which is demanded so that you can wipe away the whole thing.

So one sees all this, the misery, the agony, the aggression, the violence and the occasional beauty of love, and the occasional sense of something other than the daily monotonous routine of life. And the demand to capture that otherness, that something which man has always sought after, asked for, has been exploited by the churches throughout the world, by the religions, the clever people who say 'this is the door through which you must go, there is only one Saviour and we are his representatives', or 'there is only one organization, we know the truth and nobody else does'. There are others who say 'Come to this Ashram, to this centre, to this concentration camp, we will drill you so that you will find it'. Man's greed for the otherness has been exploited. And all of them in varying degrees teach such things as the control of thought, because you know if you would see anything very

clearly (the flower, the cloud, the bird on the wing, or the clear line of a beautiful mountain), you must look with fresh eyes, with an unspotted, innocent look, which means you must give attention.

Concentration is a waste of energy. Perhaps what we are saying is completely contradictory to what you already have heard or learnt — and I hope it is contradictory — because you will see as we go into this question of concentration how terribly easy it is to let it waste one's energy. After all, concentration is a process of exclusion — I want to concentrate on an image, on a book or something, but my mind wanders off and I pull it back to concentrate; this battle of trying to concentrate on something when the mind is interested in something else is a waste of energy, it is a process of exclusion. So one can put aside concentration completely.

But you need attention, which is entirely different from concentration. I do not know if you have ever given your attention to anything. Perhaps you may go to a museum and look at a picture or statue. Does one attend or is one always comparing, judging, evaluating? Attention comes only when you give your mind, your heart, your nerves, your eyes and ears to something completely, when you listen to truth, or to a falsehood. When you give your complete attention then there is no more problem. It is only when there is inattention, that is when there is no attention that a problem arises. And attention has nothing whatsoever to do with will and concentration. Because a mind that is inattentive is a mind that is full of thought. Do you accept what is being said, or do you deny it? What we said just now was: a mind is inattentive, is not completely attentive, when thought is operating. We said thought is inattention. I do not know if you have ever given attention. When you give attention completely with all your being there is no thought at all. It is only when we are not in that state of complete attention that thought begins. And thought is a waste of energy, because

thought is the response of memory, the response of experience, knowledge, which is necessary in the technological field but totally unnecessary and a waste of energy at a different level, at the psychological level.

So, thought is never new, thought is never free; it is always old because it is the outcome of the past, as experience, as knowledge, as memory. A computer, the electronic brain cannot produce a new thing, it repeats, it gives the answers according to what it has been told, informed; it may learn after a few experiments, as when it plays chess, it learns the moves and since it has already learnt the moves, they belong to the past. And so with us, our brains have been conditioned for centuries and centuries to live in a certain pattern of thought, a certain way and because of that thought is always old, and can therefore never bring energy. It can excite, it can give pleasure, and the pleasure and the pursuit of pleasure give us some energy, but that energy is wasted through pain.

So thought, however much it may struggle to acquire attention, can never do it, because attention is always new. It cannot be practised, or learnt step by step. A mind that has been trained, drilled, conditioned, that has lived a life of sorrow and misery is wasting its own energy. So all that it can do is to be aware of its own states, its own mood, to be aware of its own fear, of its own demands, of its own urges — just to see them without wanting to change them. The moment you say 'I must change' you bring in conflict, and then you are caught in its whole pattern. But if you actually see the thing, the fear, the loneliness, the intense sorrow that one has in which there is so much self-pity — just to be aware of that, choicelessly — if you are so aware then you will see that you have a different energy altogether, untouched by the past and therefore able to deal with that problem immediately and end it instantly, without carrying it over.

So, as we said, meditation is the summation of energy.

And you must have this energy completely so as to bring about a radical revolution within yourself. After all, it is only a young mind that can revolt, that can bring about a revolution within itself, not an old mind, not a mind that has lived sixty, seventy years within its own boundaries and has suffered and invented a lot of escapes — such a mind is a wasted mind. Such a mind can never find a way out. And such a mind generally ends in death and misery and confusion and disease in old age. As we said, it is only a young mind that has this quality of an energy that is not contaminated. It is only such a mind that is an innocent mind. It may live a thousand experiences but each experience is gone through, finished, it is not carried over, it doesn't leave a mark.

In enquiring into this way of meditation, one also has to enquire into the whole structure of thought. What is thinking, what is its worth, its meaning? Does it have any meaning at all except for technological purposes? I know thought has become very important; for us, thought, the intellect, the brain is of tremendous significance. Because you will say 'If I do not think what shall I do, what shall I become?' You can't stop thinking by *will*, but you can understand its nature and its structure and how it comes into being. Without understanding thought you will never be free of fear. Without understanding the nature of thought sorrow has no ending.

So when you begin to enquire into thought you have also to enquire into the nature of pleasure, of our evaluations, our morality, our way of life which is based on pleasure. The very search for truth, for God, or whatever you like to call it, is based on pleasure — the desire to be secure, to be certain — from which we derive tremendous pleasure. So in enquiring into this question of pleasure one has to ask oneself: is love pleasure? Is love a thing of pleasure, a thing of thought? You had an experience yesterday, it gave you great delight, it was that delight, that pleasure that has left a mark,

and thought builds upon that pleasure, sustains it, nourishes it, gives it vitality, gives it a continuity and you demand to have that pleasure again — that's what you do sexually. And this demand of thought, of pleasure, is what is generally called love. When you do so love, in it there is pain, jealousy, anxiety, fear, lack of companionship, loneliness. So, is love pleasure? Or if you love is there no pleasure? When you see something very beautiful, the cloud of an evening lit by the setting sun, the looking at it is a great delight — provided that you give your whole attention to it and you can only give your whole attention to it when you don't say, 'How beautiful', or when you aren't thinking how you can put it into words, put it on a canvas and so on — when you can look at it attentively, non-verbally. So is love a word, a symbol, an image, which gives you great pleasure? Having given you great pleasure, to be denied that pleasure is fear. Thought creates pleasure, gives it continuity, as thought gives continuity to fear. You can see that in yourself, you don't have to read any books about it, it's all there if you can look directly and very simply.

So thought is seen as the beginning of sorrow and we wish to discover for ourselves how thought comes into being. One asks oneself: 'Can thought, which belongs to time, come to an end?' Because thought and time are a waste of energy; they lead to inattention. So the question arises: 'Can the mind be completely quiet, completely still?' — not made still by thought, not made still by will and concentration — this is not stillness at all, it is mere stagnation. It is only a very still mind that can see; if you want to see a tree, a flower, if you want to see the face of your wife or husband, or friend (whatever you want to see) you have to look at it without thought, to look at it completely, with a still mind, a mind that has no association; then you will see — but you can only see when the mind is completely quiet. You know all this; and so we say 'How am I to keep this stillness all the time?'

Then begins again the problem — the 'how', which is to find a way of keeping the mind very quiet. So you invent systems, methods, gurus, practices and all the rest of it.

What is important is not how to keep the mind still — that comes naturally, easily, effortlessly if you understand, if you know how to look at the whole structure and the nature of thought, not intellectually, but actually look at the machinery of thought. And to look has its own discipline. That is the beauty of it. You know beauty and love go together; and neither love nor beauty is the product of thought and pleasure. A mind that is seeking pleasure doesn't know what it means to love, and without love there is no meditation, there is no understanding of truth.

21st April 1968

4

I OFTEN WONDER why we go to meetings to listen to others, why we want to talk things over together, and indeed why we have problems at all. Human beings throughout the world seem to have so many, such multiple problems. And we go to meetings, like these, hoping to pick up some kind of idea, a formula, a way of life, that might perhaps be of some use or help us to overcome our many difficulties, the complex problem of living. And yet, although man has lived for millions of years, he is still struggling, always groping after something such as happiness or reality or a mind that is not disturbed, that can live in this world frankly, happily, sanely. And yet, strangely, we don't seem to come upon any of these realities that will be totally, lastingly satisfying. And now here we are for the fourth time, and I wonder why we meet or talk to each other at all? There has been so much propaganda, so many people have said how we should live, what we should do, what we should think; they have invented many theories — what the State should do, what society must be; and the theologians throughout the world state a fixed dogma or belief around which they build fantastic myths and theories. And through propaganda, the endless pouring out of words, we are shaped, our minds are conditioned and gradually we lose all feeling.

To us intellect is enormously important, thought is essential — thought which can operate logically, sanely, intelligently. But I wonder if thought has any place in relationship at all? Because that is what we are going to talk over together this evening. We said we must ask fundamental questions,

essential questions. The last three times that we met here, we faced that enormous question to which man has been seeking an answer: what is the relationship of man, who is caught in this turmoil, in this endless misery (with a fluttering of occasional happiness), what is his relationship to that immense reality — if a relationship does exist at all? We went into that.

Perhaps this evening we may consider (not intellectually, but actually with our hearts, our minds, our whole being) we may succeed in giving complete attention to this question of man's relationship to man, and not only his relationship with another but also his relationship to nature, to the universe, to every living thing. But, as we saw, society is making us and we are making ourselves more and more mechanical, superficial, callous, indifferent — slaughter is going on in the Far East, and we are comparatively undisturbed. We have become very prosperous, but that very prosperity is destroying us, because we are becoming indifferent and lazy, because we are becoming mechanical, superficial and we are losing close relationship to all men, to all living things. And it seems to me that it is very important to ask this question: what is relationship, whether there is any relationship at all, and what place in that relationship love and thought and pleasure have?

As we said, we are going to consider this question, but not intellectually, because that means fragmentarily. We have broken up life into the intellect and the emotions, we have departmentalized our whole existence, with the specialist in the field of science, the artist, the writer, the priest and the ordinary laymen such as you and me! We are broken up into nationalities, into classes, divisions which grow wider and deeper. Let us consider this question of relationship, which is really extraordinarily important, because to live is to be related; and in considering this question of relationship we shall ask what it means to live. What is our life,

which needs deep relationship with another, whether as wife, husband, children, family, community or any other unit? In considering it we cannot possibly deal with this question in fragments, because if we take one section, one part of the totality of existence and try to solve that one part, then there is no way out of it at all. But perhaps we shall be able to understand and live differently, if we can deal with this question of relationship totally, not in fragments (not as the individual and the community, and the individual opposing the community, the individual and society, the individual and religion and so on, as these are all fragmentations; they are all broken up). We are always trying to solve our problems by understanding a little fragment of this whole business of existence. So could we, at least for this evening (and I hope also for the rest of our lives) look at life not in fragments — as a Catholic, a Protestant, a specialist in Zen, or following a particular Guru, master, which is all so absurdly childish. We have got an immense problem, that is to understand existence, to understand how to live. And, as we said, living is relationship, there is no living if we are not related. And most of us, not being related in the deeper sense of that word, we try to identify ourselves with something — with the nation, with a particular system, or philosophy, or a particular dogma or belief. That's what is going on throughout the world, the identification of each individual with something — with the family, or with oneself. (And I don't know what it means to 'identify with oneself').

This fragmentary, separative existence, inevitably leads to various forms of violence. So, if we could give our attention to this question of relationship, then we could perhaps solve the social inequalities, injustices, immorality and that terrifying thing 'respectability' which man has cultivated; to be respectable is to be moral according to that which is really essentially immoral. So is there any relationship at all? Relationship implies being in contact, in touch, deeply, fundamentally, with nature, with another human being — to be related, not in blood, or as part of the family, or as husband and wife as these are hardly relationships at all. To find out the nature of this question, we must look at another issue, which is this whole mechanism of building images, putting them together, creating an idea, a symbol, in which man lives. Most of us have images about ourselves — what we think we are, what we should be, the image of oneself and the image of another; we have these images in relationship. You have the image about the speaker, and as the speaker doesn't know you he has no image. But if you know somebody very intimately you have already built an image, that very intimacy implies the image that you have about that person — the wife has an image about the husband and the husband has an image about her. Then there is the image of society and the images that one has about God, about truth, about *everything*.

How does this image come into being? And if it is there, as it is with practically everybody, then how can there be any real relationship? Relationship implies being in contact with each other deeply, profoundly. Out of that deep relationship there can be co-operation, working together, doing things together. But if there is an image — I have an image about you and you have an image about me — what relationship can exist, except the relationship of an idea, of a symbol, or a certain memory, which becomes the image. Do these images have relationships, and is that perhaps what relationship is? Can there be love in the real sense of that word (not according to the priests, or according to the theologians, or according to the Communist, or this or that person) but actually the quality of that feeling of love, when the relationship is merely conceptual, imaginative, not factual? There can only be a relationship between human beings when we accept what *is*, not what *should be*. We are always living in the world of formulas, concepts, which are the images of

thought. So, can thought, can intellect, bring about right relationship? Can the mind, the brain, with all its self-protective instruments built up through millions of years — can that brain, which is the whole response of memory and thought, bring about right relationship between human beings? What place has the image, thought, in relationship? Has it any place at all?

I wonder if you ask these questions of yourself when you look at those chestnut trees with their blooms like white candles against the blue sky. What relationship exists between you and that, what relationship have you actually got (not emotionally nor sentimentally) what is your relationship with such things? And if you have lost the relationship with these things in nature, how can you be related to man? The more we live in towns, the less do we have any relation with nature. You go out for a walk on a Sunday and look at the trees and say 'How lovely', and go back to your life of routine, living in a series of drawers, which are called houses, flats. You are losing relationship with nature. You can see this by the fact that you go to museums and you spend a whole morning looking at pictures, abstractions of what is, and this shows that you have really totally lost your contact, your relationship with nature; pictures, concerts, statues, have all become terribly important and you never look at the tree, the bird, the marvellous lighting of a cloud.

Now, what is relationship? Have we any relationship with another at all? Are we so enclosed, self-protected that our relationship has become merely superficial, sensual, pleasurable? Because after all, if we examine ourselves very deeply and very quietly (not according to Freud or Jung or some other expert, but actually look at ourselves as we are) then perhaps we can find out how we isolate ourselves daily, how we build around ourselves a wall of resistance, of fear. To 'look' at ourselves is more important and much more fundamental than to look at ourselves according to specialists.

If you look at yourself according to Jung or Freud or the Buddha, or somebody else, you are looking through the eyes of another. And you are doing that all the time; we have no eyes of our own to look and therefore we lose the beauty of the 'look'.

So when you look at yourselves directly, don't you find that your daily activities (your thought, your ambitions, your demands, your aggressions, the constant longing to be loved and to love, the constant gnawing of fear, the agony of isolation) don't these all make for extraordinary separativeness and fundamental isolation? And when there is that deep isolation how can you be related to somebody else, to that other person who is also isolating himself, through his ambition, greed, avarice, demand for domination, possession, power and all the rest of it? So there are these two entities called human beings, living in their own isolation and breeding children and so on, but all this is isolation. And co-operation between these two isolated entities becomes mechanical; they must have some co-operation to live at all, to have a family, to go to the office or factory and work there, but they always remain isolated entities, with their beliefs and dogmas, their nationalities . . . you know all the screens that man has built around himself to separate himself from others. So that isolation is essentially the factor of not being related. And in that isolated (so-called) relationship, pleasure becomes most important.

In the world you can see how pleasure is becoming more and more demanding, insistent, because all pleasure, if you observe carefully, is a process of isolation; and one has to consider this question of pleasure in the context of relationship. Pleasure is the product of thought — isn't it? Pleasure was in the thing which you experienced yesterday, the beauty or the sensuous perception, or sexual sensuous excitement; you think about it, you build an image of that pleasure which you experienced yesterday. And so thought sustains, gives

nourishment, to that thing which was called pleasurable yesterday. And so thought demands the continuity of that pleasure today. The more you think about that experience that you had, which gave you a delight at the moment, the more thought gives it a continuity as pleasure and desire. And what relationship has this to the fundamental question of human existence, which concerns how we are related? If our relationship is the outcome of sexual pleasure, or the pleasure of the family, of ownership, domination, control, the fear of not being protected, not having inward security and therefore always seeking pleasure — then what place has pleasure in relationship? The demand for pleasure does destroy all relationship, whether it be sexual or of any other kind. And if we observe clearly, all our so called moral values are based on pleasure, though we put it over with the righteous sounding morality of our respectable society.

So, when we ask ourselves, when we look at ourselves, deeply, we see this activity of self-isolation, the 'me', the 'I', the 'ego', building resistance round itself and that very resistance *is* the 'me'. That is isolation, that is what creates fragments, the fragmentary look of the thinker and the thought. So what place has pleasure, which is the outcome of a memory given sustenance and nourishment by thought (thought which is always old, which is never free) what has that thought, which has centred its existence in pleasure, to do with relationship? Do please ask yourselves this question, don't merely listen to the speaker — he is gone tomorrow and you have to live your own life; so the speaker is of no importance whatsoever. What is important is to ask these questions of yourself and to ask such questions you have to be terribly serious, you have to be completely dedicated to the search, because it is only when you are serious that you live, it's only when you are deeply, fundamentally, earnest that life opens, has meaning, has beauty. You have to ask this question: whether it is not a fact that you live in an image,

in a formula, in an isolating fragment. Is it not out of that isolation that fear, with its pain and pleasure (the outcome of thought) has become aware of this isolation? That image then tries to identify itself with something permanent, God, truth, the nation, the flag and the rest of it.

So, if thought is old (and it is always old and therefore never free) how can thought understand relationship? Relationship is always in the present, in the living present, (not in the dead past of memory, of remembrances, of pleasure and pain) relationship is active *now;* to be related means just that. When you look at somebody with eyes that are full of affection, love, there is immediate relationship. When you can look at a cloud with eyes that are seeing for the first time, then there is deep relationship. But if thought comes in, then that relationship belongs to the image. So then one asks: what is love? Is love pleasure? Is love desire? Is love a memory of the many things that have been built up, stored up, with regard to your wife, to your husband, to your neighbour, the society, the community, with your God — can that be said to be love?

If love is the product of thought, as it is with most people, then that love is hedged about, caught in the network of jealousy, of envy, the desire to dominate, to possess and be possessed, this longing to be loved and to love. In that, can there be love for the one and for the many? If I love one, do I destroy the love of the other? And as with most of us love is pleasure, companionship, comfort, the seclusion and the sense of being protected in the family, is there really any love? Can a man who is bound to his family love his neighbour? You may talk about love theoretically, go to church and love God (whatever that may mean) and the next day go to the office and destroy your neighbour — because you are competing with him and want his job, his possessions, and you want to better yourself, comparing yourself with him. So when all this activity is going on inside you, morning

till night, even when you are asleep through your dreams, can you be related? Or is relationship something entirely different?

Relationship can only exist when there is total abandonment of the self, the 'me'. When the me *is not,* then you are related; in that there is no separation whatsoever. Probably one has not felt that, the total denial (not intellectually but actually) the total cessation of the 'me'. And perhaps that's what most of us are seeking, sexually or through identification with something greater. But that again, that process of identification with something greater is the product of thought; and thought is old (like the me, the ego, the I, it is of yesterday) it is always old. The question then arises: how is it possible to let go this isolating process completely, this process which is centred in the 'me'. How is this to be done? You understand the question? How am I (whose every activity of everyday life is of fear, anxiety, despair, sorrow, confusion and hope) how is the 'me' which separates itself from another, through identification with God, with its conditioning, with its society, with its social and moral activity with the State and so on — how is that to die, to disappear so that the human being can be related? Because if we are not related, then we are going to live at war with each other. There may be no killing of each other because that is becoming too dangerous, except in far away countries. How can we live so that there is no separation, so that we really can co-operate?

There is so much to do in the world, to wipe away poverty, to live happily, to live with delight instead of with agony and fear, to build a totally different kind of society, a morality which is above all morality. But this can only be when all the morality of present day society is totally denied. There is so much to do and it cannot be done if there is this constant isolating process going on. We speak of the 'me' and the 'mine', and the 'other' — the other is beyond the wall, the

me and mine is this side of the wall. So how can that essence of resistance, which is the me, how can that be completely 'let go'? Because that is really the most fundamental question in all relationship, as one sees that the relationship between images is not relationship at all and that when that kind of relationship exists there must be conflict, that we must be at each other's throats.

When you put yourself that question, inevitably you'll say: 'Must I live in a vacuum, in a state of emptiness?' I wonder if you have ever known what it is to have a mind that is completely empty. You have lived in space that is created by the 'me' (which is a very small space). The space which the 'I', the self-isolating process, has built between one person and another, that is all the space we know — the space between itself and the circumference — the frontier which thought has built. And in this space we live, in this space there is division. You say: 'If I let myself go, or if I abandon the centre of 'me', I will live in a vacuum'. But have you ever really let go the 'me', actually, so that there is no 'me' at all? Have you ever lived in this world, gone to the office in that spirit, lived with your wife or with your husband? If you have lived that way you will know that there is a state of relationship in which the 'me' is not, which is not Utopia, which is not a thing dreamt about, or a mystical, nonsensical experience, but something that can be actually done — to live at a dimension where there is relationship with all human beings.

But that can only be when we understand what love is. And to be, to live in that state, one must understand the pleasure of thought and all its mechanism. Then all complicated mechanism that one has built for oneself, around oneself, can be seen at a glance. One hasn't got to go through all this analytical process point by point. All analysis is fragmentary and therefore there is no answer through that door.

There is this immense complex problem of existence, with

all its fears, anxieties, hopes, fleeting happiness and joys, but analysis is not going to solve it. What will do so, is to take it all in swiftly, as a whole. You know you understand something only when you look (not with a prolonged trained look, the trained look of an artist, a scientist or the man who has practised 'how to look'), but you see it if you look at it with complete attention, you see the whole thing in one glance. And then you will see you are out of it. Then you are out of time; time has a stop and sorrow therefore ends. A man that is in sorrow, or fear, is not related. How can a man who is pursuing power have relationship? He may have a family, sleep with his wife, but he is not related. A man who is competing with another has no relationship at all. And all our social structure with its un-morality is based on this. To be fundamentally, essentially, related means the ending of the 'me' that breeds separation and sorrow.

25th April 1968

5

As THIS IS the last talk we shall have to consider this morning many things together and, even if we do not do so in great detail, we shall nevertheless talk about things that we have to consider seriously. To us words are necessary, words must be used to communicate; and communication can be either merely verbal or a communion, which is entirely different from mere listening to a lot of words. To be in communication implies, doesn't it, meeting each other at the same level, at the same time, with the same intensity; otherwise we do not communicate with each other. We may understand verbally, hear a series of words and try to translate them into our known background, comparing, judging and evaluating. But communion is entirely different; it comes into being when both mind and heart meet, meet the other person with the same quality of intensity, urgency and fullness — then there is a communion which goes beyond words. But most of us are so driven by the intellect that we cling to words, words have become extraordinarily important; but the symbol, the word, is never the reality. And if we are to communicate with each other this morning we must, it seems to me, meet each other, not at the verbal level, nor at intellectual heights, but rather meet each other over problems that are most important to understand and go beyond.

So what we are going to talk about needs a great deal of penetration, not verbally, but actually, because the word is never the actual, the thing itself. When we say the 'door', the word 'door' isn't actually the door, one has to touch the door to feel its substance, its grain, and the word can never

convey that. And a word like 'suffering' isn't the actual agony, misery, anxiety and fear involved in that word. To go beyond sorrow and the ending of sorrow is one of our major problems, perhaps one of our most essential problems; for a mind that suffers is always living in darkness; it cannot see very clearly, it always lives in confusion. To understand, and in so doing to end sorrow, needs a great deal of attention, bearing in mind that the word is never the thing, with its pain, despair, lack of love, sense of loneliness and consuming self-pity. But is it possible for a human being living in this world of utter chaos (where each individual is neurotically working for himself) is it possible for a human being ever to be completely rid of sorrow?

I wonder if one has ever even asked that question; or if we merely put up with sorrow, bear it, get used to it. When we do get used to anything (used to beauty, used to ugliness, used to a lovely cloud that's moving across the earth, to the flowers), when we get used to beauty or to ugliness the mind becomes very dull. Most of us have been unable to resolve this question of sorrow and so we either worship it as a symbol in a church, as the Christians do, or as in Asia, give explanations, endless explanations of the cause of sorrow. But explaining the cause never dissipates sorrow. So if one would be rid of sorrow at all levels, as one must, completely rid of it at all levels of consciousness (never to have pain, anxiety, loneliness, self-pity, which that word sorrow covers) to do so one has to understand the nature and the structure of thought and time. And, if we can, this morning we are going to explore this problem together.

To investigate we must also take part in this. You must be as intense and as objective, direct, immediate, as the investigation demands. So you are not merely listening to a formula or series of ideas, but rather we are exploring together this question of sorrow that has haunted man; and to investigate this there must be freedom. Most of us decline,

consciously or unconsciously, to be truly free. Most of us don't want to be free. Most of us want to be free in certain spots which ache, which give us pain, we want to get rid of those things that give pain, conflict and anxiety. Freedom is not a thing which is relative; either one is free or not free. One is not free *from* something — if one is free *from* something resistance is involved. If I wish to be free *from* envy, I must resist it, I must deny it, there must be control, an exercise of will, which are all various forms of resistance; and resistance is never freedom. Freedom comes only when one can look at the thing completely, intellectually, with a complete mind and heart, without any distortion. And this freedom is necessary to observe; it is a freedom in which there is no demand to resolve the problem, because the problem of sorrow is only resolved when one can look at it totally, completely, with all one's being, mind and heart, without any self-pity.

Freedom is part of this investigation because one sees that without freedom there can be no order, without freedom there can be no clarity. And to find out what freedom is (not theoretically, nor philosophically, but actually to find out with your eyes, with your mind and to feel it) one has to go into the question of fear. Sorrow can be understood and it can come to an end when there is freedom and there is no freedom as long as there is fear. But can man (living in this world, with all its complex social demands and economic pressures, with the tremendous tension, the threat of wars and of insecurity, the incessant propaganda on the part of the churches, the politicians and priests throughout the world, with this weight of pressure and influence) can man be free of fear, both outwardly, physically and inwardly? Without the ending of fear we must live in darkness, in conflict. I don't think we see the importance of being really completely free of fear. Fear makes us neurotic, fear makes us escape from daily, actual living. Fear makes us run away to the

churches, into various forms of escape, to gods, to philosophies, to theories. Fear breeds dogmas, beliefs, superstition — all those forms of neurosis exist in each one, because we are afraid. We are afraid of losing a job, of not having enough money, of not being loved, of not fulfilling, of not becoming a success outwardly and inwardly, we are afraid of being alone, of feeling the emptiness of our own lives, our utter barrenness of thought. 'Thought is the child of a barren woman'. And we are frightened of death, of life and of love. Is it possible to ask this question of ourselves — actually demand, actually ask ourselves that question, with an insistence as acute and as sharp as hunger, as intense as pain? Otherwise the answer will not come. With the intensity of demand to find out, one must come to a state of mind that is really not afraid of anything at all.

So we are going to investigate whether it is possible for a human mind that has sought security, both physical and psychological, that has been nourished on certainty (always wanting to be sure, certain, secure in everything it does, in its relationship, in its job, in its movement of thought, to be sure, certain and accurate), whether that mind which has not found security and is afraid of not finding it, can find any security at all. Psychologically, inwardly, is there such a thing as being secure, in knowledge, in belief, in experience, in possession? As you possess a house, you want to possess your wife, your husband, a relationship. But in that is there any security at all? Is there any permanency in life? Or is life a total movement in which there is no permanency whatsoever, no security whatsoever? Please do ask yourselves this question, not intellectually because that doesn't answer a thing; but find out for yourselves. That is, look at yourself, look at the state you are in, the mounting fear about everything — fear of death, fear of old age. And is there anything in life, psychologically, that is secure, that is permanent? Is your relationship with your wife, with your husband, with anything permanent? Or does thought give permanency to something that is impermanent?

Thought is always seeking something lasting in all relationships. Thought in its search for security must seek pleasure and in pleasure there is always pain and hence there is always fear. Do observe this in yourselves and you will see how simple it is, how thought comes about and how fear is bred out of thought. And so we never meet fear. Do we know actually what fear is? Or do we know it only through the recognition of what was called fear, which happened yesterday? That is, do I know fear actually the moment it happens? Or do I know it only when it has gone and then I recognize it? We are talking of psychological fears for the moment. And to understand the nature of fear one has to look also at the structure of thought, because thought does create fear. Thought says: 'I don't know what death is. I'll put it as far away as possible until the last minute. I don't have to look at it, I don't have to understand it.' Put it away, escape from it, build various beliefs, dogmas, comforting theories, as long as I don't have to face it and come directly into contact with it. So thought creates a division between the living and the thing called 'death'. You are living — this is the 'known' — and the thing 'unknown' is death.

Thought breeds time, the interval between today and tomorrow. Tomorrow being uncertainty, death and old age. One has to feel one's way into this psychological time. We know chronological time, time by the watch, yesterday, today and tomorrow, that obviously is a fact; but psychological time, the time that thought has bred through memory, as 'what is and what has been', 'what is and what should be', that requires investigation. Psychologically I am afraid. Is it possible to get rid of fear gradually, through time, by developing courage, resistance? Is it possible to give up a habit through time, gradually building a resistance against

a particular habit? All that is involved in time, time being thought; and so one is afraid, not of what actually is, but of what might be, or of what has been.

So to understand sorrow is really an immense problem, because there is not only the human, individual sorrow but the collective sorrow of man. There is the sorrow of ignorance, not of technological ignorance, but actually ignorance of oneself; and in that there is a great deal of sorrow. Take, for instance, the fact that we are used to the tradition of change through time. We say we are envious and to be rid of envy completely we need time, that is, we shall gradually resist it, gradually, every day cut it down little by little until the mind is no longer an instrument of measure. But can we get rid of anything through time? Can there be freedom from a particular habit through time? That's the old accepted way of dealing with problems. Psychologically we say 'I cannot get rid of it immediately but I will practise, I will do this or that, I will exercise my will'. All that involves time. And freedom doesn't come through time.

Freedom is an explosion which takes place only when time, as a gradual means of change, comes to an end. That is, when you see actually, not theoretically, that the gradual process is utterly false, then the very perception of what is false is the perception of what is true, isn't it? When one sees what is false, that very act of seeing is the act of truth. That is, when one observes what nationalism has done throughout the world, when one sees the danger of it, the utter fallacy of it, the brutality of it — actually *sees* it — then one is not only free of it, but that freedom is the outcome of seeing what is true; but if you say 'I will gradually get rid of nationalism by becoming international, European, gradually evolve to a wider acceptance of people' — in that gradualness you are sowing the seed of war, the seed of separation. It's like those people who are everlastingly talking about non-violence, but actually in their hearts, in their way

of life, they are violent, through their discipline and through their resistance.

The idealist is the most dangerous person on earth because he refuses to see the fact and go beyond that fact immediately. The idealist says: 'There must be non-violence and I will practise non-violence through discipline, through control, through gradual denial of everything that brings about violence' — that is, the actual fact of violence is now opposed to what he will be in the future. In that interval of time he is sowing the seeds of violence, therefore he is a most dangerous man. What is important is to see the fact, and not the ideal opposed to the fact. So if one can see violence in oneself — anger, brutality, the assertion of oneself, the demand for fulfilment, competition, the everlasting envy, which are all forms of violence — if one can see that as it is, without any distortion, without any ideals, then one is free of it, totally. So long as there is not anonymity there is violence; the mind that is anonymous is in a state of no violence at all. And the world, as it is today, is full of violence. Is it possible to be free of this fear which breeds every form of violence, to be utterly free of that fear?

I wonder how one asks this question of oneself. Does one ask it because somebody suggests it? Or does one ask it because it is a natural question, a question that demands an immediate answer, like when one is hungry — hunger is not an intellectual fact or observation, it is a daily fact, which needs to be answered. In the same way can one raise this question of fear? And in considering fear and sorrow, one has to go into this problem of death and old age. Death may happen through disease, through an accident or through old age and decay. There is the obvious fact of the physical organism coming to an end. And there is also the obvious fact of the organism growing old, becoming old, diseased and dying. And one observes, as one grows older, the problem it constitutes, its ugliness, how as one grows older one becomes

more dull, more insensitive. Old age becomes a problem when one does not know how to live — one may never have lived at all — one has lived in struggle, pain, conflict, which is expressed in our faces, in our bodies, in our attitudes.

As the physical organism comes to an end, death is certainly inevitable; perhaps the scientists may discover some pill that will give continuity for another fifty or hundred years, but always at the end there is death. There is always the problem of old age, losing one's memory, becoming senile, more and more useless to society and so on. And there is death, death as something inevitable, unknown, most unpleasant, most dreaded — and being frightened of it, we never even talk about it, or if we do talk about it we have theories, comforting formulas, either the 're-incarnation' of the East, or the 'resurrection' of the West. Or perhaps intellectually we accept death and say it is inevitable and that 'as everything dies, I will also die'. Rationalization, a comforting belief, or an escape, are all exactly the same.

But what is death? Apart from the physical entity coming to an end, what is death? In asking that question one must ask what is living? The two cannot be separated. If you say 'I really want to know what death is', you will never know the answer unless you know what living is. And what is our living? From the moment we are born until we die, it consists of endless struggle, a battle-field, not only within ourselves but with our neighbours, with our wife, children, with our husband, with everything — it is a battle of sorrow, fear, anxiety, guilt, loneliness and despair. And out of this despair come the inventions of the mind such as gods, saviours, saints, the worship of heroes, rituals and war — actual war, killing each other. That's our life. That's what we call living (in which there may be a moment of joy, an occasional light in the eye) but that's our life. And to that life we cling because we say 'At least I know that, and it is better to have that than nothing'.

So one is afraid of living, and one is afraid of death, the ending. And when death comes inevitably one fights it off. Our life is one long drawn out agony of battle with ourselves, with everything about us. And this battle is what is called love, it is a mounting pleasure, a mounting desire, with its fulfilment, sexually or otherwise — all that is our life from morning until night. And when we sleep we dream. But is dreaming necessary at all? I know the psychologists say that unless one dreams one goes mad, that one must dream, that it is an outlet. But why should we dream at all? Is dreaming necessary despite all the analysts and psychologists? It's not a question of how you interpret dreams but whether dreams are necessary.

Dreams become unnecessary when you know how to live every day, how to be aware, watch every movement of thought and feeling, give complete attention to every intimation, every hint that comes from a mind that is not open, exposed; then there is no dreaming at all. Then the mind, when you do sleep, has a quality of freshness, innocency. Unless one understands living, merely to find a way out of death is utterly meaningless. Then when one understands what it is to live, which is to end sorrow, to end struggle, not to make a battle-field of life, then it will be seen psychologically, inwardly, that to live is to die — to die to everything everyday, to all the accumulations that have been gathered, so that the mind is fresh, new and innocent each day. And that requires enormous attention. But this cannot be unless there is an ending to sorrow, that is fear, and so the ending of thought; then the mind is completely quiet — not dull, not stupid, not made insensitive by discipline and all the rest of those tricks that one plays through the study of yoga and all the rest of that business. Then life is dying, which means there is no death without love. Love is not a memory. Life, love and death go together — they are not separate things. And so life consists in living every day in

a state of freshness and to have that clarity, that innocency, there must be the death of that state of mind in which there is always the centre, the 'me'.

Without love there is no virtue, without love there is no peace, there is no relationship. That is the foundation — for the mind to go immeasurably into that dimension in which alone truth exists.

28th April 1968

FIVE TALKS IN AMSTERDAM

1

THERE ARE MANY problems both inward and outward. The outward problems are the economic, the whole world of computers, the mechanical relationship between man and the machine. Outwardly there are the political problems, and inwardly we have many psychological problems. Inside the skin as it were, there are the problems of man's relationship to man, not only his own relationship with himself but also with his fellow human beings. We have broken up these many problems as political, economic, social and psychological. We don't seem to be able to grapple with them all as a total unit, but only separately. We treat political problems on their own level, and religious problems as something entirely different and the economic problems as different again.

So one wonders — and I'm sure you've also asked yourselves — if it is at all possible to understand all these many issues of life totally, as from one source and not broken up into many fragments. Is it at all possible for human beings to resolve all these problems, not gradually but immediately, so that the mind is completely free from all the travails, all the pressures, from the many influences, destructive as well as constructive. And is it at all possible for man to be free from all problems, so that he can live totally, in a different dimension, with a different mind and heart. I wonder if one has asked these questions of oneself and whether these problems have not one common source, if they do not stem from one central basic issue? Or are they all fragmentary issues, each to be solved separately?

There is also the problem of the individual as opposed to the community, the society, the society suppressing or controlling the individual: whether there is such a thing as individuality at all, or is there only the collective, the mass? If you observe yourself, I'm quite sure you will see that what you call the individual *is* the world, *is* the other human being, is the society, the community, the culture in which you have been brought up. You are not separate at all. You are part of this whole social, economic, cultural background; so you call yourself a Dutchman or an Englishman or an Indian. That is, as an individual you are part of that whole culture, the whole tradition, inwardly. Outwardly you may have your differences but actually, deeply within the structure of thought and feeling there is no individuality, but a collective memory, a tradition, a racial residue. And one sees that the division between the individual and the community, the mass, is really utterly false. There is only a human being, whether he lives in Russia, or here, or in America or Vietnam. We are human beings. And as human beings we have these many problems.

And is it at all possible for a human being to be entirely free from all problems so that he can flower in goodness, in beauty? Can a human being, living not as an European or an Asian (it does not matter in what part of the world), can he ever be free? If he is not free, he is everlastingly a slave to machinery, to society, to all the complex problems of existence. That is one of the major problems of life, whether it is at all possible for a human being (you and me as human beings living in this world) in a very complex society, to be completely free. So that our minds can look and have a different relationship, look with clarity, with a sense of otherness.

Can a human being establish for himself his relationship with reality? That is what man has been seeking for thousands of years — the reality which you may call God or give

any other name to. Man has everlastingly been seeking that. And that is one of the essential questions man has to ask himself, otherwise life has no meaning whatsoever. To go to the office, to work in a factory, to see that all mankind has food, clothes and shelter — and then what? Is all life mechanical, a routine? Can we as human beings establish for ourselves an actual relationship with reality — not imaginary, fictitious, mythical, romantic — but actual? A relationship with reality: that is one of the basic questions we must ask. Because as one observes, the world is becoming more and more mechanical. The computer is taking charge of everything. And if we do not find out for ourselves with sanity, with reason, what is our relationship to that immense thing that man has sought, to that immeasurable reality, obviously our life is empty. Though you may get plenty of water from the tap, though life can be organized extensively to live comfortably, so that each one of us has food, clothes and shelter, unless one finds that, life becomes utterly meaningless, empty. And that's one of our basic essential questions. We must ask and find out for ourselves, not depending on anyone, on no priest, on no religion, on no belief, on no leader, no guru, no teacher. Because if we depend on another we're not free; dependence breeds fear, authority.

So this is an essential question that must be asked, whether you are a Communist or a Socialist or belong to some organized religious group. We are going to ask and not find an answer — all answers are merely verbal — but just examine it, be involved in it totally. Then we may come upon that reality and establish a total relationship with it. And the other question, equally essential, is what is man's relationship to man. Whether there is any such relationship or must we live in isolation within a self-centred activity, in separateness? And when there is separateness between man and man there must be conflict, war. Yet another question is — which again man has tried to understand for thousands

of years — what is love and what is death?

So these are the fundamental questions we are going to ask. We are going to ask them of ourselves and not rely upon another to tell us the answers. There is no answer from another — there is only a communion and in that communion one may find out the actual state for oneself.

Before we enter into the first question which is, what is man's relationship to reality and is there such a thing as reality, I think we must find out for ourselves what it is to listen? Because we feel overburdened with the whole complex problem of life with all its stresses and strains — with the extremely subtle, mechanical way of life bred by this complex process of analysis, the discovery of the cause and trying to overcome the cause — with the complex process of relationship, the greed, the envy, the brutality, the violence, the assertion of non-violence (which again breeds further aggression) the fears, the guilt, the whole human structure. Is it at all possible to put all that aside immediately so that the mind is completely new, untouched, so that it can look at the heavens, the skies, the stars, the trees, the light on the water, as though it were seeing the beauty of it for the first time? I think it comes — when one knows how to listen. Man has tried in so many ways to get rid of himself and his many problems. He has withdrawn into monasteries, he has committed himself to a particular course of action — political, religious, social or personal. He has tried to forget himself and identify himself with something greater, as the nation — or in social work, doing good to others — or to identify himself with an idea, with an ideology, with a saviour, a master, a guru, so that he can forget this agonising, immensely complex existence.

We have tried all that, but there may be a way to push it all aside with one breath, with one look. And there is. There is a way of looking, a way of hearing, seeing, so that all these problems no longer affect the mind, distort clarity.

And I feel it is possible only when we know how to listen — how to see a tree, the sky, how to see ourselves as we actually are, without any distortion, without any fear, without translating it into some ideology. To hear the wind among the trees, to hear the voice of another, to see the danger of a life that is divided, made into fragments, to see all that, at one glance! To see it is to act and therefore to put it all aside and be a human being who is totally transformed.

And so, what we are going to discuss together during these talks is going to be hard work on your part. You are not merely listening to a series of words or ideas, because we are not indulging in words, in theories; but we are actually going to be involved. To be actually involved means work. Therefore the responsibility of this work is on you, as a human being. You might ask: 'As a human being, if I change totally, if there is a complete mutation, what good will it do to society, to another man? What good will it be to drink at a fountain that quenches all thirst? What value has it in a corrupt society?' I think that is a wrong question. When you put a wrong question you inevitably get the wrong answer. When you put such a question it indicates — does it not — that you are not concerned with a human being as he is; not concerned with bringing about a transformation within the human being who is the collective, the individual, the mass, the whole world. When a human being puts that question to himself — 'what can he do in a world that is so corrupt, so violent, so brutal?' — there is no answer. But if a human being brings about this transformation within himself, then that is the most important thing in life — not the result, not how it will affect another. The cloud with the light of the sun, or the flower on the roadside, is not thinking about what good it is to another; it is there, full of beauty, loveliness, and it is for man to look and see with the fullness of his heart.

So let us take, if we may, the first essential question:

man's relationship to reality, if there is such a reality. To assume that there is or is not a reality, to assume either is the same. To say it is impossible that such a reality should exist, or to say it is impossible for man to come upon that reality, to make either statement is to block oneself. If you say, 'I doubt if there is a reality,' you've already hindered yourself from examining, from looking, from observing. Or if you say that 'there is', you've also prevented yourself from looking, from examining, from coming upon that loveliness. So to accept or to deny is to block oneself. What is necessary is freedom from both — freedom from belief that there is a God, a reality, an immeasurable something, as some saints or teachers have asserted. The moment you say 'there is', it is not. The moment you say 'I know', you do not know. All you can do is to be free from 'believing' and 'not believing', so that the mind is capable of freedom, so that it can look, observe.

So you must first examine this question, which man has asked for millenia: he has asked whether his life is only a conflict, a battlefield, misery, with an occasional flash of joy. Is all life violence, brutality? — there must be something else. And in asking this, he has caught himself up in imagination, in some fancy wrought out of his own conditioning.

So to find out if there is a thing that is imperishable, that is not to be put into words, one must first be free of all belief. That means to be free of all religious organisations. And apparently that is one of the most difficult things for man — not to have any belief in *anything*. But to arrive at this, not out of cynicism or out of despair, but because one can observe how through the propaganda of two thousand years in the West and perhaps five thousand years and more in the East, man has been conditioned to believe in a saviour, in ritual, dogma, a church, — to accept. And when you accept you are violent; when you obey you bring about aggression. You can see this happening when the whole world

is divided, not only into nationalities but also into religious groups such as the Christian, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Muslim, each with its own dogma, with its own ritual, with its own belief, its own nonsense. When you believe you are against another belief, therefore you separate yourself and this separation breeds antagonism, though you may pretend to be tolerant; that is an intellectual feat that has no validity at all.

So a man who would find that reality (or not find it) must be completely free — psychologically deeply within himself — of the influence of the word, propaganda, the symbol. Because when you believe, there is fear behind that belief. Belief is unnecessary for a mind that is free and it is only in freedom that you can look; to examine anything — a political system, an article you read in a newspaper, or to listen to the talk that is now going on — you must be free to listen. If you are not free, you merely accept or deny. And when you do accept, what value has it? Or when you deny, what significance has it? But if you are free, that is free from prejudice, free from your own particular conclusions, dogmas, prejudices, free from your particular experiences, knowledge, then you can listen, then you can observe.

So, a mind that is not free — which means freedom from fear — is utterly incapable of coming upon this reality — if there is such a reality. Because one must have tremendous scepticism, doubt. To doubt, to question, not to accept the whole social, economic, religious structure, the established order (which is essentially disorder) means that there must be no fear within oneself. To find out for oneself there must be freedom from fear. Most human beings have never gone into this question deeply within themselves. They have never asked whether it is at all possible to be completely free of fear at all levels of our existence; at the political, economic level and also inwardly in all relationships. To find out about this corroding fear there must be no escape. You know, it is

one of the most difficult things not to escape, not to avoid. One is fully aware of one's own fears, and we have developed a network of escapes, from the most simple to the most complex. When one is afraid, one wants to get rid of this fear, one wants to put it aside. And you do it by turning on the radio, taking a drink or reading a novel, or by going to church or committing yourself to a particular course of action: anything rather than face that absolute reality of fear.

To face that reality of fear, every form of escape must come to an end; not gradually but immediately. That is the whole meaning of existence: to end something immediately and not carry it over to the next day or the next minute. And that is only possible when you can see the fear, actually feel that fear completely, without any escape or without any desire to run away from it or to translate it or to get rid of it — when you actually look at it.

You know what fear does. When you are afraid of something you cannot think clearly — it becomes dark, like living in a chamber without light. I am sure most of us have experienced this fear. We have accepted it, that part of our existence which is not natural. That is the result of the society in which we live, each man seeking his own security, and so building a society which assures an outward security. This very assurance of outward security creates divisions. Those who are not secure and those who are secure, those who have and those who have not. So there is a battle, there is war and the very thing that you sought after — which is to be secure — is denied. When you have separate flags and all the confusion of different nationalities, governments, armies and the butchery that is going on, that is the result of the deep fear of human beings. We don't realise our individual human responsibility for the war that is going on in Vietnam. We are responsible for it, each one of us, not the Americans, not the Vietnamese, not the Communists, but each one of us, because our life is one of conflict, our life

is a battlefield. We are Dutchmen, we are Catholics, we are Hindus, we are Muslims, we are God knows what else, living in a separate compartment, isolated, unapproachable. And naturally when there is division there must be conflict and that is what happens in human relationships, between husband and wife, between your neighbour and yourself; there is this division, this separation, this self-isolating self-interest. We all know this. And yet we accept it, we go on. We talk about non-violence and sow the seed of violence all the time. This is part of that fear.

You listen to a statement of that kind and you say, 'Yes, we are afraid'; you know fear consciously or unconsciously. What actually takes place when you hear this? Do listen, please, and observe yourself. What actually takes place when you hear that you are really afraid of life? *Fear*. What is your actual response to it as a human being? Obviously the first is, you don't know what to do with it. All we do know is how to avoid it, how to overcome it, how to suppress it, how to control it, how to forget it. But that is no answer. It is there, like a festering wound. We don't know what to do. And that is the first thing to realise — we don't know what to do with something to which we have become so accustomed. It has become part of our life, this thing called fear. And a mind that is afraid must have belief, must have every form of escape. So the first thing is to know that one is afraid and not escape.

When you listen to this, does it mean anything at all? Because as we said, a mind that is afraid can never find light. It may invent a thing called 'light' out of fear, imagine a heaven or hell out of its own darkness. But fear still remains. So these two things are involved, freedom to look, to observe clearly, and yet there is no capacity to look when there is fear. Is it at all possible for human beings, living in a very complex society, to be free of fear completely at all levels of their being? We are going to find out, not through ana-

lysis, not through speculation but actually come into contact with the thing called fear. I doubt very much if anyone of us has actually come into contact with it, contact in the sense of touching it. You know, to be in contact with something means to be sensuously aware, to touch, to feel it, to smell it, to taste it; only then you are in communion with it, when you are related to it. I doubt whether one is actually in contact with any fear, though you may be in contact with it after it is over.

So to understand this question of fear is to understand it not as something intellectual, verbal. To understand that a precipice is a dangerous thing is a fact, not an intellectual assumption. There it is in front of you, a deep chasm. In the same way one has to be aware of fear. And we are saying, unless the mind is totally free of fear, the uncovering of reality, the flowering of that immeasurable thing is not possible. Do what you will, go to all the churches in the world, read all the sacred books (which has no meaning whatsoever), or accept a political course of action — Communist or otherwise and reduce all life to a political state — unless man is free of this fear there is no love. So we must find out for ourselves if it is at all possible to be free.

What is fear? How does it come about? One can understand the fear of physical pain, that fire burns, disease hurts. But the avoidance of physical pain is a very complex problem too. I had pain yesterday — listen to this thing very simply — I had pain yesterday and there is a remembrance of it and I hope it will not happen again today or tomorrow. I had an experience of pleasure yesterday and I hope it will come again today and I want it again tomorrow. Pain which happened yesterday, I want to avoid today and I hope it will not come tomorrow. But the pleasure which I had yesterday, I want it today and tomorrow. There lies the origin of fear — fear brought about by thought. Thought remembers the pain which actually happened yesterday. There is a

remembrance of that pain as memory, as experience, as knowledge, and out of that there is the response of thought which says: 'I hope I will not have it again today or tomorrow.' Please do observe this very simple fact in yourself and you will see. I had great joy yesterday, whether it was sexual or looking at a cloud or a flower or listening to the wind among the trees, and there is a remembrance of something pleasurable and I want it repeated; thought says: 'I must have it again today and tomorrow also.'

So thought is the origin of fear, thought being memory of a thousand experiences of pleasure and a thousand experiences of pain. There is that memory which is the result of many experiences and the knowledge of it all. That is the computer, the electronic brain, which we are. We are the past, the thousand memories associated with every experience, with every remembrance. And when that is challenged thought responds as pleasure and pain. Thought says: 'this I must have, this must continue, this must be repeated' — whether it be sex or other forms of pleasure. Or thought says: 'that was pain, it hurt tremendously, I don't want it repeated today or tomorrow'. Thought is mechanical, like the computer, the electronic brain that answers all questions more rapidly than the human brain.

Thought is old, thought is never new, thought is never free, *never*. The idea of freedom of thought is just a political thing. When you examine this whole process of thinking, go into it deeply, you will find for yourself that thought is the response of the memory of yesterday, or of ten thousand yesterdays. So it is very old, there is nothing new in it. Thought can never discover anything new. And so thought is the origin of fear. Then one asks, can thought come to an end? Can thought which is the very structure of our brain cells, can that whole structure of ten thousand years become quiet? You have to ask this question, you have to work at it hard, as we are doing now — I hope you are working

with me. So, thought is time. Time is the interval between 'what is' and 'what should be'. The pain and the fear of pain — of having pain tomorrow — the interval between 'what is' and 'what should be' or 'what may be' is the projection of thought. And so out of thought arises the thinker, the thinker who says, 'this is pleasure' and 'this is pain'. And the whole complex of fear begins.

12th May 1968

2

IF WE MAY, we will continue with what we were talking about yesterday. When you look at a field stretching out to the horizon — a field of tulips — words come into your mind: how beautiful it is, the colour, the brilliancy, the texture, the depth of the colour. This whole field of colour with its beauty is put into words. Or you translate it in terms of some symbol; or you want to write about it, paint it, carry some of those flowers back to your house. And as you observe, thought begins to discern, to judge, to evaluate. And as you still go on looking, there is a space between you and the flower, between you and that field of brilliant colour. This space, this division between the observer and the thing observed, the thinker and the thought, means there are two separate things. In this division between the observer and the thing observed is the whole issue of life, the whole problem of existence. In that division there is conflict, there is choice, there is constant struggle.

As we said yesterday morning, we have many problems at all levels of our existence. And we ask ourselves if it is not possible to find the root of all these innumerable, complex, subtle problems, instead of dealing with each problem by itself; whether we could not by observing the very core, the very root of our problems, go beyond, by finding that one root from which all our problems spring.

And we also asked yesterday whether it is possible for man, living in modern society, with its tremendous pressures, with its competition, with its corrupt morality, with its total disorder, whether it is at all possible to be free of fear. Not

only the fear of something we do not know — as death — but also the fear of life, this daily, monotonous life of routine, of strife, of endless competition; this constant measuring of oneself with something more, the measurement of success, of achievement, in which there is frustration, agony, an incessant struggle within and without. Can man — that is, you and I — ever be free from this central issue, or rather one of the main issues of life, which is fear?

We also said yesterday that thought is the origin of fear; thought which divides the observer from that beautiful field of tulips. And we asked whether thought — which interferes, which gives shape, a certain contour of judgment — whether that thought (which breeds pain and pleasure, upon which we depend so much to solve all our problems) can ever resolve any problem. Now that may be the central issue, that may be the core which, if we understand it, may resolve all our problems. Because man has relied on thought. Everything we do or don't do is born out of thought. Organized thought is idea and according to an idea, an ideal, we act. Action, if you observe, is always a living thing: to do, to be, to act, is always in the living present; and the idea, the ideal, is in the future, unreal. So in action, when there is a division between the act and the doing, there is always conflict — doing, which is now, and comparing the doing with the ideal; then in that there is conflict. And so there is no action at all. Action then is merely an approximation to what should be.

So one asks oneself whether it is possible to act — please just listen to it first, don't say 'it is', or 'it is not' — whether it is possible to act without idea; which means that the seeing is the doing. We do this when there is grave danger, when we are confronted with a tremendous crisis. In great danger there is instant action, there is not the idea or the ideal according to which you are acting, there is instant response to an immediate challenge. Then thought has no time to operate. You must have noticed this yourselves, in your own lives.

That when there is some grave danger or immediate demand for action, thought has no time to come and interfere with the doing. And as we said yesterday, fear, with which we are concerned this morning, is born out of thought. Thought of tomorrow, of what was a pleasure or a pain yesterday, the sustaining of that pain or pleasure through thought, gives a continuity to pleasure or pain. That's fairly clear, I think, isn't it?

Take any problem that one has, national, international, the feeling of isolation, the feeling of being one group opposed to another group or community, white against black and so on. The problem was created by thought, which is fairly clear. Thought, which has sought security through division, through nationality, through separatism, has created the problem. Then thought sets about to resolve that problem. And thought cannot resolve that problem. One may pass laws, but legislation does not destroy separateness, the sense of isolation, exclusion through opposition to others. And yet we employ thought all the time to resolve all our problems. But if you observe, thought has created the problem.

Take war. Historically for 5,000 years men has had 12,000 wars; that means two and a half wars every year! Thought has bred war, antagonism. Thought has built a way of life which must inevitably lead to war. One realizes that; then thought says, 'there must be peace'. So it sets about inventing various plans, ways, methods, by strengthening itself on the one hand as a nationalist army, and yet on the other by striving for international peace and brotherhood — all this contradiction is brought about by thought. And as one observes in all human relationship, thought by seeking comfort, security, pleasure — sexual or otherwise — creates many problems. And so we resort to thought to resolve these very problems which thought has created.

One can see how fear comes into being. There is the phy-

sical fear of pain, of disease, of old age and death, or of the pain that one had some time ago and which may come back. Thought remembers the past experience and remembering it, reacting to that remembrance, thought produces fear. One can see this clearly in one's life. One has a disease, physical pain, cancer, or some other disease and thought, which remembers a state of mind when there was no pain, no disease, gets frightened of it. Then thought says: what are the ways out of it, physically? When one has a disease, and most of us do have some kind of physical disorder and pain, why should thought interfere at all? — thought as a response of memory of when one had no pain at all. Why should such thought interfere — which only breeds further anxiety?

And psychologically, inwardly, inside the skin, we have many problems of fear, from the most simple, like fear of darkness, to the most complex problem of human relationship, which is called love. And there is fear of death.

As one observes within oneself, not according to any philosopher, any analyst or any specialist (for when you do observe according to another, then you are not observing yourself, you are observing yourself according to some specialist, then what he says becomes far more important than what actually you are), but if you put aside all the specialists and assertions, you can see for yourself the innumerable contradictory states, the anxiety, the guilt, the sense of loneliness, despair, routine, the way of life which becomes mechanical. Thought breeds this. So one asks oneself whether thought — which has its place, thought being mechanical, thought being old, thought which is the result of experience, memory, knowledge that must operate when you do mechanical things, like remembering one's address, like remembering a technological activity, otherwise we couldn't possible live or do anything — whether thought has any place other than that. Because as we have said, thought breeds fear — fear not only of our neighbour, fear of life, fear of ourselves, fear of

so many things! And as one observes oneself, within oneself, as a human being, one can see very well how fear has come into existence. Is it possible to be completely free of fear? Which means really the whole investigation of the structure and nature of thought.

As one observes, man has lived on thought. Life is something that is constantly new. Life is challenging us all the time with new demands, with new phases, with new ways of living. And to that challenge we always respond according to our old pattern, which is thought. And so there is a contradiction. So, is it possible — please don't think I'm crazy — is it possible to end thought? Is it possible to look at that field of tulips without the interference of thought or of the word? I do not know if you have ever tried (or if you have ever done it) to look at a flower, at a cloud, or at a tree, without the word, without the memory, the knowledge of that thing which you have seen before; and to look at it as though you were looking at it for the very first time — to look at it without the thinker and therefore without thought. So that space between you, as the observer, and the thing observed, ceases. Not that you become the flower, or identify yourself with the flower — which would be absurd, you can't be a tulip. People try to identify themselves with what they see; that is too infantile, too immature. But to see that field of tulips without the centre, without the observer, the thinker — if you have ever done it you will see that space disappears.

And when there is no space between the observer and the observed, then the observer *is* the observed. That's fairly easy to do outwardly, with a flower, with a cloud, with a bird that is flying across the sky. And this can be done through various forms of drugs with which they have been experimenting; because a drug, a chemical, removes that space instantly and there is that sense of complete, total observation of 'what is'. Please do follow this because we're going into something very complex presently. Just listen

to it. We are not advising that you should take drugs in order to destroy the separateness. It doesn't actually destroy it at all. A drug brings about a chemical change in the nerves, in the whole system, making the system highly sensitive and this sensitiveness to the flower on the table destroys that space, but it is artificial. You have to take the drug again in order to have that experience. We have not taken it, though we have talked to those who have taken it, and you can see what actually takes place. As we said, when you observe the tulip sensuously, with your eyes, and this colour stretching right to the other end, without word, without any movement of mind or thought, then space disappears and there is quite a different state of mind which looks. That's fairly easy to do with objective things. But it becomes much more complex, much more subtle, when you have to do with inward things, such as fear, such as anger, aggression, violence; when there is violence which is the inheritance of the animal in man, because we are all extraordinarily violent, aggressive people.

One has to recognise first of all inwardly that one is violent, which takes so many different forms — violence of opinion, of judgement, in assertion, domination, the violence of self-discipline, the violence of conformity to a pattern, the violence of acceptance and obedience, the violence that exists in each one of us, the violence to dominate, to assert, to attain power, position, prestige. In almost all human beings this violence exists, sexually, and in other ways.

Now, how to deal with violence so that it is completely, totally eradicated from the mind, from the whole structure of thought? When you observe that violence in yourself (if you are at all aware of that violence) as you observe, you see that there is a thinker and the thing called violence, aggression, anger and so on. Please, as we are talking, do it, observe it (if I may suggest) in yourself. At this present moment you may not be angry, violent. But as you observe you can see there are times when you have been greatly

angry. And as you observe you will see that there is a division between the thing called anger and the observer. The observer says: 'I have been angry', or, 'I must not be angry any more'. There is violence and non-violence.

As you observe, naturally, there is a division between so-called anger and the entity that says: 'I am angry, I have been angry'. Right? That's fairly simple. Then when there is this division between the thought and the thinker, who says 'I have been angry', there is a separation. Right? In that time-interval, in that space, there is a conflict of overcoming anger, trying to control it, trying to pass beyond it or accepting it as being natural, inevitable. So in that interval begins all the conflict. Right? Please do it as we're talking, actually do it. And you'll see for yourself the fact that emerges out of this.

We have accepted this division for centuries, for thousands of years that has become part of our tradition. The way to deal with anger — I'm only taking that as an example — is to overcome, control, suppress it and so on. The entity who suppresses it, controls it, is something separate, we think. Now, is it separate? Or is the entity who thinks he is angry, is he anger himself? — that is not separate at all? There is only a state of anger, a state of violence. When we recognize the fact that we are violent, then we invent the ideal of non-violence, hoping thereby to overcome violence, using the idea of non-violence as a means, or as a lever, to get rid of violence. This is our traditional way of dealing with anything.

Now is there a different way, so that there is no conflict at all when one meets violence in oneself? I hope you're following my question. We know that the normal, accepted, traditional way of dealing with any problem, is violence. All that involves conflict, struggle, pain, and at the end of it you are not rid of violence — it is still there. So one asks, is there a different way altogether which is not traditional

at all? Which is, to observe that anger without the interference of thought — as you observed that flower in the field; and as you observed that flower without any thought, there was neither the observer nor the observed, there was only a state of *seeing*. In the same way, is it possible to look at violence without the interference of thought, to merely observe it? This becomes quite a complex problem, because when we say we are violent, the very process of recognition of violence is the product of thought. Right? That is, you have been angry before, yesterday, and there is the remembrance of it today and when you are angry a little later, the remembrance of that experience (which you have called anger yesterday), that memory responds to the new reaction, which is called anger. So thought in the process of recognizing anger, or violence, and of wanting to get rid of it, is still a way to conflict, suppression, or imitation. Right?

Are you following some of this or not at all? (It doesn't matter. It's up to you anyhow). Because one must be totally free of violence, otherwise we are not human beings. The mind is violent in any form; in the expression of a word, a look, a gesture, you destroy love. And when you have no love, there will be no peace in the world. You may have all the Leagues of Nations and 'United Nations' and every thing that's happening in the world, more and more, but you'll never have peace. And without peace you cannot see clearly. There is no love, there is only this ugly, monstrous civilization of the machine.

I do not know if you have ever talked to the specialists who are concerned with the electronic brain, with the computers — what they are doing. The computers are taking over all the activities of man, almost all the activities. They are building a society where the machine is going to rule. This obviously is coming. Man is going to have a great deal of leisure and perhaps only the specialists will be the masters and the rest like you and I will be slaves. Probably a new

culture is being built, of which we are not at all aware. Those who are concerned with it, involved in it, are greatly, perturbed. Unless we human beings bring about a total mutation in the way of our living, which is the way of life, then thought — which is merely mechanical, for thought is not new, not fresh, the quality of freshness isn't in it at all — thought is going to control our life; thought, as the computer, is going to guide our life. That's why it is enormously important — please do look at it for yourselves — to find out a way of living where thought, which is mechanical, doesn't intervene except when it has to function mechanically.

And that's why it is very important to understand the nature and the structure of thought. What is thought? What is thinking? Don't wait for me, for the speaker, to answer it. Here is a challenge — do please listen to it — what is thought? What is thinking? What is the origin of thought? That's a challenge which is something new; and how do you respond to it? Do you begin to search for an answer, wait for someone to tell you the answer, or do you say, I don't know? And in the very saying 'I don't know' are you waiting to find out and say: 'I do know the answer now'? Or when you meet such an immense challenge, what happens? If the challenge is really vital, important, then the mind becomes quiet, doesn't it? Thought is in abeyance, because it has no answer. But we, wanting an answer, wanting to find a way out of this mechanical way of life, we use thought to find out. And so we reduce the new challenge to the old, and challenges are always new if they're vital — and they *are* vital. Our houses are burning, our morality, our churches, our society is in disintegration, corrupt. There is an immense challenge, which we have to meet — the challenge of the computer and the relation of man to it.

If you wait for the specialist to answer that question, then you are back again, caught. So the question is, how to bring

about a complete mutation, a complete change in our life, a change, a mutation that will solve all our problems? I think the root of our problems — of fear, violence, the immense sorrow of life, the everlasting search for pleasure — the root cause, the core of all this problem, is thought. And is it possible to put a stop to time, time which is thought. You know, we are used to the idea, to the tradition, that eventually, gradually, slowly, day after day, we will be different, there will be a mutation of the mind through evolution, so that we shall have human beings who have a totally different mind. When you admit that 'eventually' — that eventually you will have a new mind, a totally different quality in the structure and nature of the mind — when you admit that, you're still living in a world of mechanical existence. And this generation will be responsible for the next, through education and all the rest of it, so there is no 'eventual' change at all. We are becoming more and more mechanical, not less.

So the fundamental question is — not how to get rid of fear, violence, the innumerable problems that each of us has — but the fundamental question is, whether thought, as time, can come to an end. So that there is no actual tomorrow, psychologically. Do you understand? Please do be concerned with it, be involved in it, in this question. You know, we so easily commit ourselves to a course of action. I think there is a difference between being committed and being involved. We are involved with life, we are not committed to life. When you are committed to a course of action, as a Communist, a Socialist, a Catholic or what you will, that commitment is a deliberate process of the intellect and thought. There's nothing new in that. But if you are involved, as we are, in daily life, involved in all the problems, then there is no separation, it's not the function of thought which says 'I'm involved'. You *are* involved. And so one asks: is it possible for thought as time and fear to come to an end?

We have explained sufficiently in detail the way of thought, the way of time. We'll go into it differently another time. But the explanation, the description of the cause, will never put an end to time. Giving a description of what good food is, to a hungry man, has no value — he wants food. So if you are satisfied merely with the description of the way of thought, and reconcile yourself with the description, then there is no ending. But if you are involved in the question, as you must be involved if you are at all serious — and to the very serious man only *that* is living, (not the man who is committed to some form of activity, political, social, religious, which *makes* him serious — such a person is not serious) — but only a man who is involved and is concerned with the problems of the whole of life; not casually, not as an observer just looking on from the outside, but *being involved in it,* completely, with the heart and with the mind.

Then you have to answer this question about the mind, which is the result of thought, which is the result of time — time as evolution, time from the animal till now, millions of years — which has produced this brain. And now that brain is acting mechanically, it's so heavily conditioned. Can there be a total mutation, so that we live in a different dimension altogether? That is the real problem. How do you answer this question? The traditional way to answer this question is to analyse, to analyse the whole process of our living, step by step — not only the conscious, but the unconscious mind, analysing every feeling, every thought, every movement — which the analysts and the psychologists are doing. That involves time. And in that process there is a great danger. Because to analyse, you must not only have the capacity to analyse extraordinarily clearly, without any bias, without any misjudgment — and you cannot possibly so analyse because the analyser himself is conditioned. Also the whole analytical, intellectual, verbal process involves time: whilst you are analysing, day after day, the mechanical pro-

cess of society, culture, is shaping your mind, forcing you, directing you, driving you.

So analysis is not the way. You must see the truth of that. Because if you see the truth of that and the falseness of analysis, then you will reject it totally. Then when you do reject, totally, the way of analysis, (as we have tried to point out today), then seeing the falseness of it is seeing the truth of it. Right? When you see something false and recognize it as being false, that very action is truth. When you do that, when you completely see the falseness of analysis, then what have you? You are faced with the problem of looking without the drive of the analyser. Right? You're looking without analysis at the fact. Then you are looking at fear as though with fresh eyes, aren't you? There is no overcoming it, there is no analysing it, but a looking at it as you look at that field of tulips. When you look at fear without the analyser, without the thinker, without the observer, then is there fear at all?

You can only look when the mind is completely quiet. When you look at that field of tulips and your mind is chattering, inattentive, then you're not really looking at those flowers. But when you give your total, complete attention, which is to give your mind, your heart, your nerves, your ears, your eyes to look totally, then you will see there is no division at all and therefore there is no fear at all. You can't accept this: you have to do it! That means you have to be involved in it; and you are involved in it. It's your life. Therefore to look is the greatest of miracles. You have to do nothing else but to give complete attention to looking at that field, to looking at your wife or your husband, to looking at your belief, to looking at your opinions, judgments, evaluations. Then you will see there is no state of fear at all. The mind has undergone a tremendous change. It's only a mind that is inattentive that makes mischief.

12th May 1968

3

WE WERE CONSIDERING the question of thought, how it divides and brings about fragmentation in life. If I may, this morning I would like to go into the question of thought in relationship between man and man. What place has thought? As one observes, right through the world, we have brought about fragmentation in life. We regard business as something different from daily life. The religious people are different from the scientists. The socialist is different from the communist. The individual is opposed to the community, or the community is opposed to various forms of nationalities. As one observes, throughout the world there is this fragmentation going on, both outwardly and inwardly. And where there is fragmentation there must be opposition, resistance. One is aware of that. And seeing this fragmentation one wonders if it is all possible to bring about so-called integration, whether there is such a thing as integration at all. Or is that entirely a false idea?

You can't put black and white together and integrate it, you will produce some other colour. So there must be an action that cannot ever be fragmented, broken up, as political, religious, family, individual, community and so on. And it seems to me that it is very important to find out, whether it is at all possible to act so totally, so completely, that the religious life is not in opposition to the family and business life; that one particular course of action is not opposed to another. Many people consider that given the proper economic and social environment everything will come right, and then man will live happily ever after; that it is all a matter of political arrangement.

So life is broken up into fragments, one can observe it in oneself. One hates and loves, one wants to be good, and there is always this resistance against temptation, evil and so on. And one asks oneself whether an action that is never broken up, never fragmentary but always complete, is at all possible. If we may, this morning, we are going to find out — not intellectually, not as an idea or as a theory, but actually find out for ourselves in daily life whatever we are doing — whether it is possible to act so completely, so wholly, that there is no fragmentation whatsoever.

To go into this question fully, one has to understand, it seems to me, the question of pleasure and the discipline that is entailed in all living. For most of us, pleasure is the guide to almost everything. We give up one pleasure for a greater pleasure, the minor satisfaction for a greater one, and so on. And each pleasure, each gratification brings its own discipline, a discipline conforming to a pattern set by previous pleasure, previous remembrance of an experience, which moulds the activity of thought. As one observes, most of us, probably ninety nine point nine per cent, act according to the dictates of pleasure. And that pleasure takes the form of morality, righteousness, virtue, an ideal and so on. Is there not fragmentation when pleasure is the principle of life? Because inevitably pleasure must breed fear. One can see very simply and very clearly how pleasure operates: the remembered experience of a great delight yesterday, the demand for its continuance, the fear that it may not continue — and there already the fragmentation of life has begun.

Not that we are opposed to pleasure — that would be absurd — but we have to understand the nature and the structure of pleasure. That is really very important, because pleasure does bring about this breaking up of life, as the religious life and the social life and so on. When you see a leaf fluttering in the wind — and there is a great deal of wind in Holland — you see the beauty of that leaf rejoicing, dancing

in the wind; that is a great delight, a great pleasure. When you see a sunset, full of light and glory, or when you see a beautiful flower, a lovely face, there is an enjoyment. You cannot deny or suppress or transmute that pleasure; it is *there,* one has to accept it as one accepts the blue sky, the green earth, the desert, the mountain. But when it becomes the dominating demand of life, as it is with most of us, an insistent conscious or unconscious demand, then there is this constant breaking up of life into compartments, into fragments.

In asking what pleasure is, one also has to ask what love is. What is the place of pleasure in human relationship and is pleasure love? For most of us — unless we indulge in absurd ideologies and theories which have no meaning whatsoever — love is pleasure. And one has to go into this question fairly deeply to find out what place thought has in the relationship between human beings, and if relationship is based on pleasure, or if it is the outcome of love, affection. This is what we are going to talk over together, if we may; that is, we are going to commune together. Verbal explanation may bring about a certain quality of communication, one must use words to communicate, but words in themselves have no reality; they are a means of telling each other what we feel, what we think, what we understand, what we perceive. But perhaps we could establish a relationship not of words, so that we could commune with each other at a different level altogether, not at the verbal level, though words must be used. This communion in discussing a very complex problem like relationship and all the things involved in it, is not a mental process; it is not something you understand intellectually, gather a few ideas about and think that you have understood. On the contrary, to understand any complex human problem one must be completely in communion with it; that is, one must give one's mind and one's heart to the understanding of this question. Therefore one has to listen

with a great deal of attention, care and affection; not merely live at an intellectual level — then all communication and communion comes to an end.

So we are going to talk this over together very seriously, not casually, not listening or giving importance to a speaker, to a lot of words and ideas, which is all too absurd and infantile. But if we could this morning, go into the question of relationship, perhaps we should come upon that action which is always total whatever you are doing; whether you are going to the office, working in a factory, cooking, washing dishes or digging in a garden, milking a cow, holding the hand of another, or looking at a tree or a cloud, seeing the beauty of a bird; it is all one action, stemming from one source. So, in examining, enquiring into this question of relationship, one must also ask, what place has thought in relationship — thought being the response or the reaction to memory, knowledge, experience, which is the past. What place has the past in relationship? If the past controls all action in human relationship — as it does with most people — then is it relationship at all? Relationship surely is the whole movement of life between people, a movement, not a static state which is remembered, and which acts from that remembrance.

Is all this too verbal? Let us put it differently, if we may. Relationship means to be related, to be in contact, to touch, to feel, to see what the other human being is, to be intimately in contact with the other (the other may be a person, an idea, a propagandist ideology) — to be related implies that. That is, to be related is always in the present; otherwise you are not related. Unless you are in constant contact with the reality of a human being, with all his peculiarities and so on, unless you are completely in contact in the present, there is no relationship at all. If I am related to you according to an image which has been built by the remembrance of a thousand yesterdays, and according to which I act, is that relationship?

You have an image about me, a symbol, an idea, and according to that image, idea, symbol, you act in this relationship with me. So you are acting according to a remembrance of things past — pleasurable or painful — and I am also doing the same; we are living in the past. An action springing from the past is what we generally call relationship.

And we are questioning this whole thing altogether. You know, it is very important to question everything, to doubt everything anybody says, including the speaker — especially the speaker — because you are so easily influenced, especially when teachers come from the East! (Laughter). You think they have got a mysterious philosophy, or mission, an extraordinary oriental mysticism — all that childish rubbish! It has no validity at all, it only breeds authority and superstition and hero-worship, which has no place whatsoever in understanding what truth is. And that is what we are trying to do, to find out for ourselves — not through somebody else, not through some guru, some teacher — but find out absolutely for ourselves what truth is: not an abstract truth, but truth of life, truth in everyday-living, so that one is tremendously honest with oneself.

So do not, please, accept what the speaker is saying, but use him as a mirror in which you see yourself as you are. That may be rather frightening. But one has to see in order to find what is true — not according to some opinion, not according to the experience of another or the theory of another, but actually see yourself in that mirror. We are discussing this question of relationship, which is tremendously important, because all life is relationship; life ceases when you have no relationship, like a monk who withdraws into a solitary cave, or a room, or whatever it is — he is still related, though he may pretend not to be. He may be related to an idea, a concept, a formula but he is still related. And to be related means to be active in the present, otherwise there is no relationship. For most of us relationship

means a remembrance of some pleasure or pain, accumulated in relationship with another, between the husband and the wife, between the children and so on. So all our relationship — if one observes — is based on an image. And the image is the past, adding to it or taking away from it, but always the core of it is the past.

You can see very easily for yourself how this relationship, how this image is built. One hasn't got to go into it — the mechanism of it is fairly obvious: thought thinking over the insult, the pleasure, the sexual demands and appetites and their fulfilment and so on; thought has gradually built it up as pleasure and pain and that is the core of all our relationship, whether it be between man and woman; or between the individual and the community, or the community, the nation and the world. So when one is examining this question of relationship one naturally has to understand the whole process of thinking. Is there any relationship in love, in the sense that we have accepted it? What is the place of thought in love? Is there love when there is thought?

And what place has pleasure in relationship? — whether it be sexual pleasure or the pleasure of companionship, of being together, living together, and all the problems involved in that. Do please observe it in yourself, don't merely listen to me. Because if love is pleasure, when that pleasure is thwarted there is pain, there is jealousy, there is hatred, there is anger. And can jealousy exist when there is love? Yet that is what we have; we say, 'I love you' and with it comes all the agony, the fear, the anxiety, the domination, possessing, being possessed, giving, in which there is pleasure. Possessing is also a form of pleasure. All this exists in what one calls love. If there is no love, then what is relationship? And we have no love, obviously. If there were love we would have a totally different kind of education, we wouldn't destroy our children. So one has to go into this question of pleasure, and in enquiring into the question of pleasure there is also the

question of pain and fear. Pleasure is sustained and nourished by thought, which is fairly simple to see for oneself: remembrance of a pleasurable incident, thought giving it continuity today and looking forward to it tomorrow. In this process there is the fear of not having it tomorrow and wanting it guaranteed.

So thought has an immense importance in our life, in relationship. Thought breeds envy, comparison, jealousy, and when thought breeds these things, we are not related at all. When each human being lives in his own isolation, in his own self-centred activity — though he may be married, have children, sex, and all the rest of it, he is still isolated — how can there by any relationship?

So when one sees that actually — not theoretically — either you accept it as it is, cherish it, polish it, give a tremendous significance to it when it has none whatsoever, or you completely deny the whole structure of it, deny this whole tradition of relationship, which inevitably breeds such hatred, such jealousy, such antagonism. And then one also has to ask: why is there so much sorrow in this relationship? Why does the human heart carry this burden right through the world, from the most backward village to the most highly sophisticated town? Can sorrow ever end?

This is a very important question to ask; not get used to sorrow — that is what most of us do. We put up with it, accept it, or worship it, as the Christians do, symbolized in the Church. But one never asks why this sorrow exists; not only the individual sorrow, but the sorrow of man, the sorrow of humanity, the sorrow of the world — the man who has very little to eat, has no shelter, is oppressed, he is in great sorrow. And the oppressor also is in great sorrow. The man at the altar is in sorrow as well as the businessman — every human being has this enormous burden of sorrow. And we have accepted it as part of our existence. When you accept anything — whether it is the most beautiful thing which you

see in a picture, or the line of the mountain, or the flowering tree — when you accept it and get used to it your mind and heart become dull, stupid. And in that there is no innocence.

So is it possible to end sorrow? As a human being living in this world, living with a family, with children, living in loneliness, despair, anxiety, guilt-ridden and so on, which all bring sorrow — is it possible to be free of it? Which means, is it possible to analyse the whole problem of sorrow — how it comes, from what source it springs, how it has continuity in our life, darkening our eyes, our heart, our speech, our outlook? Must one analyse it step by step, examine it, discover the cause? And when you do discover the cause, and understand it, does sorrow end? Apparently it doesn't — it never has. So there must be a different approach to the ending of sorrow, to the understanding of this sorrow, the sorrow that love brings, the sorrow when you are not loved by the one whom you want to love, the sorrow in your own heart. Can all that come to an end so that we are human beings living in delight, in beauty, in happiness, in truth. This is not something mysterious out of the dark East; it is a human problem.

First of all, to end it one must understand the nature of time, because we accept time as a way of overcoming things, of resolving things. There is sorrow and we say: gradually, through the process of time we will somehow put it away from us. Does sorrow end through time — psychological time, and also chronological time? Through chronological time one may get used to it, gradually day after day put up with it. But psychologically, inwardly, we say to ourselves, I will get rid of it, slowly, or try to forget it, rationalise it, escape from it. Surely there is only one way to end sorrow, not through analysis, not through escape, not through rationalization, but to meet it, to look at it, to be in complete communion with it, to be utterly related to it.

Do please listen to this. You know, when you look at a

tree, you never look at it except with the image you have of that tree, the botanical knowledge of it. Your eyes see through the image of knowledge, of remembrance or of pleasure, but you never look at it without the image, without thought — merely look. And I'm sure you never looked at your wife or husband, looked in that sense, without the image which you have about her or about him. And when you look at the cloud, at the bird, the light on the water, without the image, then you are directly in contact with it, there is no space between you and the thing that is observed. Do it sometime and you will see it for yourself. The time-interval between the observer and the thing observed, the distance, the space, undergoes a tremendous change. In the same way, look at sorrow without avoiding it, without naming it, without cherishing it, but look at it, be completely in contact with it. And you can only be in contact with it when you give complete attention to it, care, and you cannot attend to it completely unless your mind is quiet. When there is no resistance to sorrow then you will see that it undergoes a total change — which doesn't mean you accept sorrow, it doesn't mean that you identify yourself with it. You *are* the sorrow: there is not you and sorrow. The observer, the thinker, *is* the thought. And when you realise that tremendously — not as an idea but as an actuality, something that you feel, touch, see — then you will find that fear, as well as sorrow, comes to an end when you come directly into contact with it.

We also have to find out for ourselves what love is. You know, they talk so much about it! How that word has been spoilt by the politician, by the theoretician, by the priest, by the husband, by the wife — how human beings have destroyed that lovely word! It is heavily loaded. And to find out what it means — not intellectually, but to come upon it — one must not do anything about it. You understand? If you do anything about it, it's the action of thought and

thought is old. Thought operates always in the field of the known. And only in freedom from the known is there innocence, which is love. You understand? You may learn this phrase, but the word is not the actuality; which means really, to love there must be no fear, no sorrow. It is not a matter of the love of the one or the many, it is just love. And that comes about only when you understand the whole activity of the self, of the me, with all its contrivances, cunningness and absurdities; when you actually come into contact with the absurdity of thought.

Thought has its place; technologically unless you know where you are going to you won't be able to get to your house; you have to know it. But if love is the product of thought, then there is in it pain, hate, envy, division. So really to love means to die, doesn't it? To die to everything that you have known as the 'me'. And one doesn't want to die in that sense. We are all much too egotistical, much too self-centred, with our opinions and judgments, with our country, with our Gods and our beliefs. If one could completely set aside all that, not through will, not through determination, but merely see it very clearly with eyes that have never been touched by the past, so that you see it totally anew! That is to see the self, the 'me', with eyes that are innocent. It is one of our problems that we are all very old, perhaps not in body, but we are old in tradition, deep down historically. Being very old we are not innocent — innocency is not of time, it is the ending of yesterday. And when yesterday ends then there is love in relationship.

18th May 1968

4

ONE CAN TALK endlessly, describing, piling words upon words, coming to various conclusions. But out of all this verbal confusion, if there is one clear action, that action is worth ten thousand words. Most of us are afraid to act, because we ourselves are confused, disorderly, contradictory and miserable. We hope, despite this confusion, this disarray, that some kind of clarity may come into being, a clarity that can never be clouded over, a clarity that is not given or induced or taken away, a clarity that maintains itself without any effort, volition, without any motive; a clarity that has no end and therefore no beginning. Most of us, if we are at all aware of our inward confusion, do desire this; we want such clarity.

This morning, if we may, (and I'm sorry you have to sit in a hall when there are lovely clouds, sunshine and waving trees outside) let us see if each one of us can come upon this clarity, so that when you leave this hall your mind and your heart are very clear, undisturbed, with no problems and no fear. If we could go into this it would be immensely worthwhile for each one of us to see if one could be a light to oneself, a light that has no dependence on another and that is completely free. To go into this one has to explore rather a complex problem. Either one can explore it intellectually, analytically, taking off layer after layer of confusion and disorder, taking many days, many years, perhaps a whole lifetime — and then perhaps not finding it. Either you do that, this analytical process of cause and effect; or perhaps you can sidestep all that completely and come to it directly — without

the intermediary of the authority of the intellect, or of a norm. To do that requires that much abused word 'meditation'. That word has unfortunately become a monopoly of the East and therefore utterly worthless.

I don't know why the Orient has this peculiar dominance over the West about spirituality, as though they have got it in their pocket and can give it out to you. Most of them do so at a considerable expense, you have to pay for it! Or they use it as a means of exploiting you in the name of an idea or a promise. I don't know why it is so, both in India and with those unfortunate people who come out of that country, including myself (though I am not an Indian, I refuse to have any nationality); there is a peculiar feeling that being an old civilization, having talked a great deal about this peculiar quality of spirituality, that they therefore have this authority. But I'm afraid they haven't — they are just like you and me, they are just as confused and dull — though perhaps clever with their tongues, and they have learnt one or two tricks and can try to convey to others a system, a method of meditation.

So that word meditation has become rather spoilt; like love, it has been besmirched. But it is a lovely word, it has a great deal of meaning, there is a great deal of beauty, not in the word itself but the meaning behind that word. And we are going to see for ourselves, each of us, if we cannot come upon this state of mind that is always in meditation. To lay the foundation for that meditation one must understand what living is — living and dying. The understanding of life and the extraordinary meaning of death is meditation. It is not searching out some deep mystical experience; not — as it is done in the East — a repetition of words, as the Catholics and others also do, a constant repetition of a series of words, however hallowed, however ancient. That only makes the mind quiet, but it also makes the mind rather dull, stupid, mesmerised. You might just as well take a tranquilizer, which

is much easier. So the repetition of words, self-hypnosis, the following of a system or a method — that is not meditation.

I think we should be very clear about these two facts, experience and following a method, a system, that promises a reward of some vast transcendental experience. When one talks about experience, the word itself means, does it not, to go through something, to be pushed through? And to experience also implies, doesn't it, a process of recognition? I had an experience yesterday, and it has either given me pleasure or pain. To be entirely with that experience one must recognize it. Recognition means something that has already happened before and therefore experience is never new. Do please bear this in mind. It can never be new because it has already happened and therefore there is a recollection, a remembrance, a memory of it and therefore a person who says, 'I've had great transcendental experience, a tremendous experience', such a person is exploiting others, because he thinks he has had a marvellous experience, which already has happened and therefore is utterly old. Truth can never be experienced, that is the beauty of it, because it is always new, it is never what happened yesterday. That must be totally, completely, forgotten or gone through — what happened yesterday — the incident of yesterday must be finished with yesterday. But to carry that over as an experience to be measured in terms of achievement, or to convey to others that extraordinary something, to impress, to convey, to convince others, seems to me so utterly silly.

One must be very cautious, guarded, about this word experience, because you can only remember an experience when it has already happened to you. That means, there must be a centre, a thinker, an observer, who retains and holds the thing that is over; therefore it is something already dead; it is nothing new. It is like a Christian steeped in his particular conditioning, burdened with two thousand years of propaganda; when he has a vision of his Saviour, whatever

he may call him, it is merely a projection, it is his own conditioning, his own wish, his own desire. It is the same with Krishna or whoever it is.

So one must be tremendously cautious about this word. You cannot possibly experience truth as long as there is a centre of recollection as the 'me', as the thinker; then truth is not. And when another says that he has an experience of the real, distrust him, don't accept his authority. We all want to accept somebody who promises something, because we have no light in ourselves, but nobody can give you that light, no one — no guru, no teacher, no Saviour, no one. Because we have accepted so many authorities in the past, have put our faith in others, either they have exploited us or they have utterly failed. So one must distrust, deny all spiritual authority. Nobody can give us this light that never dies.

There is another thing involved in this acceptance of authority — the following of another who promises, through a certain system, method, or discipline, the eventual, ultimate reality. To follow another is to imitate. Please do observe all this, listen to all this simply. Because that is what one has to do: one has to deny completely the authority of another, however pretentious, however convincing, however Asiatic he be! To follow implies not only the denying of one's own clarity, of one's own investigation, one's integrity and honesty, but also it implies that in following, your motive is the reward. Truth is not a reward. If one is to understand it, every form of reward and punishment must be totally set aside. Authority implies fear. And to discipline oneself according to that, fear of not gaining what the exploiter in the name of truth or experience says, is to deny one's own clarity and honesty. So if you say you must meditate, you must follow a certain path, a certain system, obviously you are conditioning yourself according to that system or method. Perhaps you will get what that method promises, but it will

be nothing but ashes. For the motive is achievement, success and at the root of that is fear, and fear is connected with pleasure.

So have we clearly understood that between yourself and myself there is no authority? The speaker has no authority whatsoever. He is not trying to convince you of anything, nor asking you to follow. You know, when you follow somebody you destroy that person. The disciple destroys the master and the master destroys the disciple. You can see this happening historically and also in daily life, when the wife or the husband dominate each other they destroy each other. In that there is no freedom, there is no beauty, there is no love. So, having set that our clearly, we can now proceed to meditate about life, about death, about love. Because if we do not lay the right foundation, a foundation of order, of clear line and depth, then thought must inevitably become tortuous, deceptive, unreal, and therefore valueless..

So the laying of this foundation, this order, is the beginning of meditation. Our life, the daily life which we lead, from the moment we are born until we die — through marriage, children, jobs, achievements — our life is a battlefield, not only within ourselves but also outwardly, in the family, in the office, in the group, in the community and so on. Our life is a constant struggle: that is what we call living. Pain, fear, despair, anxiety, with sorrow constantly our shadow, that is our life. Perhaps a small minority can observe this disorder without finding external excuses (though there are external causes for this confusion). Perhaps a small minority can observe it, know it, look at it, not only at the conscious level but also at a deeper level, neither accepting nor denying this disorder, this confusion, this frightening mess in ourselves and the world — and it is always the small minority that brings about a vital change.

You know a great deal has been written about the unconscious, especially in the West. Extraordinary significance

has been given to it. But it is as trivial, as shallow as the conscious mind. You can observe it for yourself; if you observe it you will see that what is called the unconscious is the residue of the race, of the culture, of the family, of your own motives and appetites — it is there, hidden. And the conscious mind is occupied with the daily routine of life, going to the office, sex and all the rest of it. To give importance to the one or to the other seems to me so utterly sterile. Both have very little meaning, except that the conscious mind has to have technological knowledge in order to earn a livelihood.

This constant battle, both within at the deeper level as well as at the superficial level, is the constant way of our life. It is a way of disorder, a way of disarray, contradiction, misery. And such a mind trying to meditate, by means of some school in the East, is meaningless, infantile. Yet many do, as though they will escape from life, put a blanket over their misery and cover it up. But meditation is bringing about order in this confusion, not through effort, because every effort distorts the mind. That one can see: to see truth the mind must be absolutely clear, without any distortion, without any compunction, without any direction. So this foundation must be laid; that is, there must be virtue. Order is virtue. This virtue has nothing whatever to do with the social morality, which we accept. Society has imposed on us a certain morality, but the society is the product of every human being. Society with its morality says you can be greedy, you can kill another in the name of God, in the name of your country, in the name of an ideal; you can be competitive, envious, within the law. Such morality is no morality at all. You must totally deny that morality within yourself in order to be virtuous. And that is the beauty of virtue; virtue is not a habit, it is not something that you practise day after day in order to be virtuous. That is mechanical, a routine, without meaning. But to be virtuous means, does it not,

to know what is disorder — disorder which is this contradiction within ourselves, this tearing of various pleasures and desires and ambitions, greed, envy, fear — all that. Those are the causes of disorder within ourselves and outwardly. To be aware of it! That is, to come into contact or to be in contact with this disorder. And you can only come into contact with it when you don't deny it, when you don't find excuses for it, when you don't blame others for it.

In the denial of that disorder there is order. Order isn't a thing that you establish; virtue which is order comes out of disorder, to know the whole nature and structure of disorder. This is fairly simple if you observe in yourself how utterly disorderly and contradictory we are. We hate, yet we think we love. There is the beginning of disorder, of this duality. And virtue is not the outcome of duality. Virtue is a living thing, to be picked up daily, it is not the repetition of something which you called virtue yesterday. That becomes mechanical, worthless. So there must be order. And that is part of meditation. Order means beauty, and there is so little beauty in our life. Beauty is not man made; it is not in the picture, however modern, however ancient it is; it is not in the building, in the statue, nor in the cloud, the leaf or on the water. Beauty is where there is order — a mind that is unconfused, that is absolutely orderly. And there can be order only where there is total self-denial, when the 'me' has no importance whatsoever. The ending of the 'me' is part of meditation. That is the major, the only meditation.

Also we have to understand another phenomenon of life, which is death — death from old age, or disease, and accidental death, through disease or naturally. We grow old inevitably and that age is shown in the way we have lived our life, it shows in our face, whether we have satisfied our appetities crudely, brutally. We lose sensitivity, the sensitivity one had when one was young, fresh, innocent. And as

we grow older we become insensitive, dull, unaware and gradually enter the grave.

So there is old age. And there is this extraordinary thing called death, of which most of us are dreadfully frightened. If we are not frightened, we have rationalised this phenomenon intellectually and have accepted the edicts of the intellect. But it is still there. And obviously there is the ending of the organism, the body. And we accept that naturally, because we see everything dying. But what we do not accept is the psychological ending, the 'me', with the family, with the house, with success, the things I have done, and the things I have still to do, the fulfilments and the frustrations — and there is something more to do before I end! And the psychological entity, we're afraid that will come to an end — the me, the I, the soul, in the various forms, words, that we give to the centre of our being.

Does it come to an end? Does it have a continuity? The East has said it has a continuity, there is reincarnation, being born better next life if you have lived rightly. If you believe in reincarnation, as the whole of Asia does (I don't know why they do, but it gives them a great deal of comfort), then in that idea is implied, if you observe it very closely, that what you do now, every day, matters tremendously. Because in the next life you're going to pay for it or be rewarded — how you have lived. So what matters is not what you believe will happen next life, but what you are and how you live. And that is implied also when you talk about resurrection. Here you have symbolised it in one person and worship that person, because you yourself don't know how to be reborn again in your life now (not in Heaven at the right hand of God, whatever that may mean).

So what matters is, how you live now — not what your beliefs are — but what you are, what you do. But we are afraid that the centre, called the 'I', may come to an end; and we ask: does it come to an end? Please listen to this!

You have lived in thought, that is, you have given tremendous importance to thinking; but thinking is old, thinking is never new, thinking is the continuation of memory. If you have lived there, obviously there is some kind of continuity. And it is a continuity that is dead, over, finished, it is something old; therefore only that which ends can have something new. So dying is very important to understand: to die, to die to everything that one knows. I don't know if you have ever tried it? To be free from the known, to be free from your memory, even for a few days; to be free from your pleasure, without any argument, without any fear, to die to your family, to your house, to your name, to become completely anonymous. It is only the person who is completely anonymous who is in a state of non-violence; he has no violence. And so to die every day, not as an idea but actually! Do do it sometime.

You know, one has collected so much, not only books, houses, the bank account, but inwardly, the memories of insults, the memories of flattery, the memories of neurotic achievements, the memory of holding on to your own particular experience, which gives you a position. To die to all that, without argument, without discussion, without any fear, just to give it up. Do it sometime, you'll see. It used to be the tradition in the East, that a rich man every five years or so, gave up everything, including his money and began again. You can't do that nowadays, there are too many people, everyone wanting your job, the population explosion and all the rest of it. But to do it psychologically — not giving up your wife, your clothes, your husband, your children or your house, but inwardly — is not to be attached to anything. In that there is great beauty. After all, it is love, isn't it? Love is not attachment. When there is attachment there is fear. And fear inevitably becomes authoritarian, possessive, oppressive, dominating.

So meditation is the understanding of life, which is to bring

about order. Order is virtue, which is light; this light is not to be lit by another, however experienced, however clever, however erudite, however spiritual. Nobody on earth or in heaven can light that, except yourself, in your own understanding and meditation.

To die to every thing within oneself! For love is innocent and fresh, young and clear. Then, if you have established this order, this virtue, this beauty, this light in yourself, then you can go beyond. This means that the mind, having laid order, which is not of thought, the mind then becomes utterly quiet, silent — naturally, without any force, without any discipline. And in the light of that silence all actions can take place, the daily living, from that silence. And if one were lucky enough to have gone that far, then in that silence there is quite a different movement, which is not of time, which is not of words, which is not measurable by thought, because it is always new; it is that immeasurable something that man has everlastingly sought. But you have to come upon it; it cannot be given to you. It is not the word, nor the symbol, those are destructive. But for it to come, you must have complete order, beauty, love, therefore you must die to every thing that you know psychologically, so that your mind is clear, not tortured; so that it sees things as they are, both outwardly and inwardly.

19th May 1968

5

As one observes what is happening in the world, the chaos, the confusion and the brutality of man to man, which no religion or social order — or perhaps disorder — has been able to prevent, as one observes the activities of the politicians, the economists, the social reformers, right throughout the world, one sees they have brought more and more confusion, more and more misery. Religions, that is organised beliefs, have certainly in no way helped to bring order, deep abiding happiness to man. Nor have any utopias, whether the Communist or those minority groups who have formed communities, brought any deep lasting clarity to man. And one needs a tremendous revolution right throughout the world; a great change is necessary. We do not mean an outward revolution, but an inward revolution at the psychological level, which obviously is the only hope, is the only — if one can use the word — salvation for man. Ideologies have brought brutality, they have brought various forms of killing, wars; ideologies, however noble, are really quite ignoble. There must be a total mutation in the very structure of our brain cells, in the very structure of thought. And to bring about such deep lasting mutation, revolution or change, one needs a great deal of energy. One needs a drive, a sustained, constant intensity, not the casual interest, or passing enthusiasm which brings about a certain quality of energy, which is soon dissipated. To really bring about this change in human beings at the psychological level, inside the skin as it were, we need energy, force, intensity, drive. And that energy man has hoped to come by through resistance, through constant

discipline, imitation, conformity. You can see it in the religious orders throughout the world, or in those people who have committed themselves to a particular ideology. They hope by believing, acting according to an ideology, or by dedicating themselves to a particular belief, doctrine, dogma, to derive that intense quality of energy which is necessary to bring about a radical change in the human mind and heart. Yet that resistance, conformity, discipline, mere adjustment to an idea, has not given man that necessary energy and force. So one has to find a different action that will bring this necessary energy.

In this present structure of society, in our relationship between man and man, the more we act, the less energy we have. For in that action there is contradiction, fragmentation, and so that action brings conflict and therefore wastes energy. One has to find the energy, which is sustaining, which is constant, which does not fade away. And I think there is such an action which brings about this vital quality which is necessary for a deep radical revolution in the mind. For most of us action, that is 'to do', to be active, takes place according to an idea, a formula, or a concept; if you observe your own activities, your own daily movement in action, you will see that you have formulated an idea or an ideology and according to that you act. So there is a division between the idea of what you should do, or what you should be, or how you should act and *actual* action; you can see that in yourselves very clearly. So action is always approximation to the formula, to the concept, to the ideal. And there is a division, a separation, between what should be and what is, which causes duality and therefore there is conflict.

Please, as we said the other day, and at all the talks here, do not merely listen to a series of words — words have no meaning in themselves, words have never brought about any radical change in man; you can pile up words, make a garland of them, as most of us do, and live on words, but they are

ashes, they do not bring beauty into life; words do not bring love, and if you are merely listening this evening to a series of ideas or words, then I am afraid you will go empty handed. But if you would listen, not only to the speaker, but to your own thoughts, listen to the way of your life, listen to what is being said not as something outside of you, but which is actually taking place within you, then you would see the reality — or the falseness — of what is being said. One has to see what is true and what is false for oneself, not through somebody else. And to find that out you have to listen, you have to give care, affection, attention, which means to be very serious; and life demands that we be serious, because it is only for the mind that is very serious that there is life — there is an abundance of life. But there is not to the curious, not to the intellectual, not to the emotionalist, not to the sentimentalist.

We are talking about action (for life is action, all living is action, all relationship is action) and when one observes the movement of action within oneself, one sees there is this division between what should be — the ideal — and what the actual action is. Most of our action is the outcome of an idea, an ideal, a belief, a supposition, a formula and therefore there is a division and in this division there is the approximation, trying to come as close to the ideal as possible. In that there is conflict and this conflict is a waste of energy, it is the very source of wastage of energy. Action means doing, acting in the living present, and when there is action according to a pattern then action is not in the present, it is according to the past or according to the future; and therefore in that action there is confusion, there is conflict. Do please see this very simple fact, that in this there is a tremendous wastage of energy. That is the basic, fundamental, distortion of energy, which is to act according to a principle, to a belief, to an ideology.

Is there action without the formula? I hope the question

is clear. That is, when action — which is always in the active, living present — is an approximation, or trying to get as close to the ideal as possible, then there is conflict. And that conflict is the essential waste of energy. We need tremendous energy to bring about a psychological change in ourselves as human beings, because we have lived far too long in a world of make-belief, in a world of brutality, violence, despair, anxiety. To live humanly, sanely, one has to change. To bring about a change within oneself and therefore within society, one needs this radical energy, for the individual is not different from society — the society is the individual and the individual is the society. And to bring about a necessary radical, essential change in the structure of society — which is corrupt, which is immoral — there must be change in the human heart and mind. To bring about that change you need great energy and that energy is denied or perverted, or twisted, when you act according to a concept; which is what we do in our daily life. The concept is based on past history, or on some conclusion, so it is not action at all, it is an approximation to a formula.

So one asks if there is an action which is not based on an idea, on a conclusion formed by dead things which have been. We are going to find out, if we can work and co-operate together this evening — not merely listen to the speaker — to find out if there is an action which brings more energy, not less and less.

There is such action. Stating that is not the creation of another idea. One has to find out that action for oneself, and to find out one has to begin right at the beginning of our human behaviour, of our human quality of mind. That is, we are never alone, we may be walking in a wood by ourselves but we are not alone. You may be with your family, in society, but the human mind is so conditioned by past experience, knowledge, memory, that it does not know what it is to be alone. And one is afraid to be alone because to be

alone implies — does it not? — that one has to be outside society. One may live in society but one has to be an outsider to society. And to be an outsider to society one has to be free of society. Society demands that you act according to an idea; that is all society knows, that is all that human beings know — conform, imitate, accept, obey. And when one accepts the edicts of tradition, conforms to the pattern which society has set up (which means human beings have set up) then one is part of this whole conditioned human existence, which wastes its energy through constant effort, constant conflict, confusion, misery. Is it possible for human beings to be free of this confusion, of this conflict?

Essentially this conflict is between the action and what that action should be. And one observes within oneself, as one must, how conflict constantly drains energy. The whole social structure — which is to be competitive, aggressive, comparing oneself with another, accepting an ideology, a belief and so on — is based on conflict, not only within oneself but also outwardly. And we say, if there is no conflict within oneself, no struggle, battle, we shall become like animals, we shall become lazy, which is not the actual fact. We do not know any other kind of life than the life we live, which is the constant struggle from the moment we are born until we die; that is all we know.

As one observes it one can see what a wastage of energy it is. And one must extricate oneself from this social disorder, from this social immorality; which means one must be alone. Though you may live in society you are no longer accepting its structure, values — the brutality, the envy, the jealousy, the competitive spirit — and therefore you are alone; and when you are alone you are mature — maturity is not of age.

Throughout the world there is revolt, but that revolt is not through the understanding of the whole structure of society, which is yourself. That revolt is fragmentary; that is, one may revolt against a particular war, or fight and kill

another in one's favourite war, or be a religious believer belonging to a particular culture or group — Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, what you will. But to revolt means to revolt against the whole structure, not against a particular fragment of that culture. To understand this whole structure one must first be aware of it, one must first look at it, become conscious of it; that is, be choicelessly aware of it. You can't choose a particular part of society and say 'I like this, I don't like that', 'this pleases me and that does not please me'. Then you are merely conforming to a particular pattern and resisting the other pattern, therefore you are still caught in the struggle. So what is important is first to see the picture of this whole human existence, the daily existence of our life — *to see it!* Not as an idea, not as a concept, but actually be aware of it as one is aware of being hungry. Hunger is not an idea, it is not a concept: it is a fact. In the same way, to see this confusion, this misery, the constant endless struggle, when one is choicelessly aware of this whole thing, then there is no conflict at all; then one is outside the social structure because the mind has extricated itself from the absurdity of society. Because you have ideals you are aggressive; because you have beliefs, dogmas and belong to certain groups and communities you are violent.

So, is it possible to look, to observe oneself — not analytically, but just to observe — because 'oneself' is the human being, oneself is the social structure, oneself is the entity that has brought about this social disorder, so that when you observe without any choice, then you begin to understand the total nature of this structure. In that understanding there is action which is not based on a formula, it is a total action. And that is the state of maturity. We are not mature, we are more or less unbalanced people. After all, the extreme form of imbalance is that a man believes he is something he is not, or has so identified himself with an ideal, he is not capable of living. And if I may say so most of us — probably ninety-

nine point nine per cent — are rather unbalanced, because we are pursuing ideals that have no value at all, we are idealists, we are violent. You belong to one group, which believes in certain ideals, and another to another and there is war. So when one is aware in the sense that there is no choice whatsoever, then out of that action comes what is not fragmentary. You don't love and hate; then there is only a quality of life that is not touched by hate, anger, jealousy, envy. And to come upon that one has to have great energy.

You know, man — that is each one of us wherever we live — wants to find a state of mind, a state of living, which is not a travail, which is not a battle. I am sure all of us, however lowly or however intellectual we are, want to find a way of life that is orderly, full of beauty and great love. That has been the search of man for thousands of years. And instead of finding it he has externalised it, put it out there, created gods, saviours, priests with their ideas and so he has missed the whole issue. One must deny all that, deny totally the acceptance that there is heaven through another, or by following another. Nobody in the world or in heaven can give you that life. One has to work for it — endlessly.

And in understanding this whole business of existence, this life which is so painful, one must also ask what is the meaning of life, what is it all about. We are educated badly, we are trained for a particular job, a livelihood, then we slip into family life, then comes the endless struggle — is that what human beings live for, is that all life is? Therefore we invent a theory of God, a theory of an 'otherness'; that there is something beyond this life, or there is something in us which is the true divinity and so on and so on, which are absolutely not facts. The facts are in our daily life — and we must deny the whole structure that we have invented in order to escape from our daily life. It is in our daily life that we have to bring about a change and not in some ideological future world.

So one has to ask oneself: what is it all about? What do we live for? What is the meaning of life? The meaning of life is not according to the theoreticians, the theologians. They are so conditioned by their belief, by their experience, by being tethered to a particular church or group, they cannot possibly see the meaning of life. We have to see it for ourselves, not according to somebody else. So one has to ask this question: what is it all about? What is the meaning of life? Is there a meaning to life at all? Or is there only this life of struggle, battle, despair, sorrow and endless confusion. Man has asked this question. Is isn't the first time we are asking it. Man has asked it and not finding the meaning, invented a meaning, given a significance to life. That is the intellectual trick — giving significance to life. But to find out for oneself what the significance is, what the meaning of life is, without inventing a meaning, then one finds out if there is one or if there is not. Therefore one has neither to accept, nor reject. That is, one has to be totally negative to find out. Do please see this point. To see anything clearly the mind must be empty. To see even the leaf of a tree, if the mind is chattering, thinking of other things, problems, is full of ideas, knowledge, it never sees the beauty, the loveliness of a leaf. In the same way, to see the deep meaning of life — if there is any meaning at all — the mind must be emptied of its own conditioning. Can the brain cells, which have been anthropologically and biologically conditioned for millions and millions of years, can that heavily conditioned brain be utterly quiet so that it can see something new?

In asking that question, whether there is a meaning to life at all, one has to find the answer for oneself; the mind, the brain itself has to be extraordinarily quiet. That is to say, the old brain; the old brain which is so heavily conditioned, which responds and says: I am a Catholic, I am a Protestant, or I am a Dutchman, I am a Hindu and all that nonsense. To find out the significance — if there is one — that old

brain must be quiet. And that is part of meditation — not to suppress it, you can't suppress it, you can't alter it, you can't change it — but you can see, if you are choicelessly aware, how the old brain is always interfering, always responding immediately according to its conditioning. If you are choicelessly aware of it, then you will see it becomes fairly quiet; there is an interval between the challenge and the response. When there is a response to any challenge, it is the old mind that responds immediately. And when you are aware without any interference — therefore choicelessly aware of the fact — then you will see that the old brain becomes extraordinarily quiet. And that is the whole meaning of meditation. The word has been so spoilt by exploiters or by those people who have a particular system which they want to thrust upon others; which means they don't know what meditation means at all.

So, to find out if there is a significance in this life, which is so full of sorrow and misery with an occasional flutter of happiness and delight, one has to put that question in all seriousness to oneself. You will find the answer only when the old brain is not made tranquil by drugs, by tricks, when it is quiet you will find that there is a meaning. And in the discovery of that meaning, the observer, who is the centre (the ego, the me, the personality, the entity that gathers character unto itself as the thinker, the experiencer) comes to an end.

You know, it is one of the most extraordinary facts of life that our consciousness, our mental condition, is very narrow, very limited, because we think in fragments and being aware of this limitation we try by various means to expand that limitation through reading, through taking drugs, through various psychedelic experiences, through various chemicals, because we realise our minds are so petty, shallow, everlastingly offering opinions, judgments. One realises that and so one says, is it possible to go beyond this limitation?

And the danger of it is that we invent a god: all gods are man's inventions, the saviours, the gurus, those who say, 'We know and you don't know'. But if you reject all that *completely* then you will find for yourself that there is tremendous significance to life, not an invented significance. Then we will know what love is. Then we will know what action is, and what virtue is. Virtue is not harsh; virtue is order and that order cannot possibly come about through harshness, which the priests have practiced throughout life and imposed upon people: the idea that one must live a harsh life which is called austerity, to find reality. Obviously one must lead an austere life, but that austerity is not born out of harshness; it comes naturally, easily, through understanding. To understand this whole life is to be choicelessly aware of it; you will see for yourself, if you go that far — and you must go that far, because our house, our life, is being destroyed. To put an end to all that one must in daily life be so intensely, choicelessly aware, that all conflict comes to an end. And out of that comes an aloneness, which gives an abundance of energy, and that energy brings a radical revolution at the deep inner level. Then perhaps you will be lucky. It is a strange thing that you cannot invite reality, you cannot invite the whole heavens and the beauty of the earth — all that you have to do is to leave the window open and let that beauty, that love, come. But to leave the window open you must have order and therefore deny this total disorder of life, of this society which man has created. And only when there is this complete inward order, then one comes upon that immeasurable reality.

We have got five minutes more — do you think it would be worth while to ask questions? Just a minute, Sir, before you ask a question. I know we have many questions because we must question everything, doubt everything, including what the speaker has said. That's the only way to find out, because

that is the only way to be free, but to ask a question the question must be a right question. We never ask the right questions, the essential questions. And that is one of the most difficult things to do, because to ask a right question you must have gone into the question yourself and when you have gone into the question very deeply you have already answered it. But if you wait for another to answer that question, however right it be, it will be only verbal, which means you have not worked upon it yourself, gone into it, explored it. So one must ask the right question. And the right question will always find the right answer; not from another, the other is merely a sounding board and the sounding board is not important. You know that word 'guru', which is so misused all over the world, means 'the one who points out': like a post by the roadside he points out the direction. You don't build a shrine round that post, you don't put garlands round it, you don't obey it, you don't give respect to it, you look at it and pass by. But when the post becomes important then you are lost, then you are exploited. In asking questions (and we must), we need a great deal of intelligence, not intellect. Intelligence comes with maturity and maturity is that state of mind which is completely alone. One doesn't see the enormous beauty of being alone, one is afraid of it. Love is alone and therefore it is incorruptible.

Yes, Sir?

Questioner: What is the best attitude towards hostility and brutality?

KRISHNAMURTI: I wonder what we mean by attitude. Why do we want an attitude? What does attitude mean? Taking up a position, coming to a conclusion. I have an attitude about whatever it is, which means I have come to a conclusion after study, after examining, after planning, after

probing into the question. I have come to this point, to this attitude, which means that very assumption of an attitude is resistance; therefore that in itself is violence. We cannot have an attitude towards violence or hostility. That means you are interpreting it according to your particular conclusion, fancy, imagination, understanding. What we are saying is: is it possible to look at this hostility in oneself, this creating enmity in oneself, this violence, this brutality in oneself without any attitude, to see the fact as it is? The moment you have an attitude you are already prejudiced, you have taken a side and therefore you are not looking, you are not understanding that fact within yourself.

So, Sir, to look at oneself without an attitude, without any opinion, judgment, evaluation, is one of the most arduous tasks. In this looking there is clarity and it is that clarity which is not a conclusion, not an attitude, that dispels this total structure of brutality and hostility.

Have I stopped you all from asking questions? I hope not!

Questioner: If we understand what it is to listen with our whole being, do we understand everything else you are talking about too?

KRISHNAMURTI: Do we understand anything if we give our heart and mind to it? Is that it Sir?

Questioner: You have mentioned many things in your talks, one of the things you have mentioned is listening with our whole being. If we understand listening with our whole being, does that mean that we understand everything else that you say?

KRISHNAMURTI: Obviously! — if we listened with our whole being to any problem. Because Sir, look: all problems are related to one problem, there is no 'one problem' and 'other problems'. All problems, human problems, are inter-related.

And when I understand one problem *completely* I have understood all problems. To understand the problem of envy — I am taking that as an example — does not mean probing and examining it intellectually, coming to a conclusion and saying 'It is right' or 'wrong', or whatever it is. To understand it means to *listen* to that problem, and you cannot possibly listen to that problem if your mind is not quiet. When you understand one problem, however deep or however superficial it be, that problem is related to all other problems. Then if you listen to it quietly, without any choice, are aware of it, you will see that you will begin to understand and transcend all problems.

Questioner: Isn't it better not to do a kindness when it is only done out of duty, without love?

KRISHNAMURTI: If there is no love, but you do some kindly action out of duty, is it worth while? Need you ask that question? Need one reply to that question? You know that word 'duty' is a terrible word. We use that word only when there is no love. The heart that loves has no duty and no responsibility. When there is love, do whatever you will, then there is responsibility; but if it is a responsibility born out of duty and there is no love, it is a most awful action, because it brings confusion and misery.

22nd May 1968

GOA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
TALEGAO - GOA
Donation ACC No. 020
Name of Donour A. De Albuquerque